THE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. XIII.—No. 14. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 TIM. III. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 638.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1843. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 109 NASSAU-ST. { TERMS—$3 00 PER ANNUM—IN ADVANCE.

WORSHIP: THE USE OF A LITURGY;

A Charge to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania. Delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, on Wednesday, May 17th, 1843, at the opening of the Convention. By the Rt. Rev. HENRY U. ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese.

(*Concluded.*)

To form an idea of what public worship ought to be, we may picture to our minds the mode in which it was conducted before the eye of the psalmists and prophets who have recorded so many of its acts; but without including the services that were but typical, shadows of the greater Christian doctrines, which vanished when the Gospel brought its light. In that worship, we learn in Scripture, there was order, great splendor, and much sacred pomp; there was abundance of music; there was kneeling in prayer, particularly of the more earnest kind, standing in praise, and every dignified ceremony that could aid the mind by outward association. The Psalms were a chief portion of their liturgy; and these were performed in the solemn responsive method, one part of the worshippers answering the other part, each inciting each to greater animation and zeal: this practice being at least as old as the time of Miriam, and followed by the priests who "sang together by course," or "ward over against ward," and observed also by the seraphim in the vision of Isaiah. (Exod. xv. 21; Ezra iii. 11; Neh. xii. 24: Isa. vi. 3: see also 1 Sam. xviii. 7, xxi. 11.) When each act of prayer or thanksgiving was concluded, the people in a body pronounced their loud and united *Amen.* (1 Chron. xvi. 36; Neh. viii. 6; Ps. cvi. 48.) Occasionally there were sacred processions, the attendants worshipping and uttering praises as they proceeded in their solemn march. And at all times the ministering priests were clothed with the holy garments which were ordered them "for glory and for beauty." (Exod. xxviii. 2, 40.) Now, let it be observed, none of the solemnities and ceremonies here numerated were of a merely typical nature, such as would be abolished when our Saviour had fulfilled the types. It was the shedding of blood for atonement that was typical, the sprinkling of blood, the tabernacle and its furniture, the "divers washings," and some other kindred matters: and these are done away. But the observances of their general worship, their liturgical forms, the order and grandeur of their public devotions, their devotional postures, their devotional music, and the like, were not typical, were not "shadows of good things to come," but the substance of "good things" then enjoyed. And being proper accidents of worship then, they are its proper accidents now, with the additions and alterations required by the full revelation of the Gospel. That is a gratuitous interpretation, which converts them into types now cancelled. Nor should it be forgotten, that it is derogating from the word of God, to allege that more of it is put aside than we have clear authority for so regarding; it is incurring a risk of the anathema which is declared against those who take away aught from the sacred volume.

Such then was the public worship that came under the eye of God's inspired servants. And such was the public worship that our Saviour attended, always giving it his entire countenance, and not requiring his disciples to abandon it; so that, for many years after his ascension into heaven, the apostles and Jewish Christians continued to frequent the courts of Mount Zion. Nor does it appear that these portions of the temple service were ever abrogated in a formal manner, as were the types mingled with them, the atoning sacrifices and the sprinklings; on the contrary, their ceasing, so far as we learn, was but incidental to the distraction and dispersion of the Jewish nation. Had the nation embraced the Gospel, and not been dispersed, their sanctuary would have ranked as a Christian Church, and these very services have become part of the Christian solemnities there observed: so at least we have good reason to think. Why are not forms and holy pomp in worship, the same or kindred with those in the temple, absolutely prohibited in the New Testament, as are bloody offerings for expiation, and the like,—why are they not at least discountenanced there,—if they are unfavorable to evangelical piety or evangelical devotion? Not an intimation against them is found in that holy book. The presumption therefore is unavoidable, that the general public worship was to continue in the new Church of Christ as it had been in the old Church of Moses, without needless changes.

Hence it is, that we find that the worship established by the apostles was conformed, perhaps as much as circumstances allowed, to the ancient method. The apostles enjoined the use of the "psalms" and other "hymns and spiritual songs" of Scripture; and with the psalms, and other such forms, they of course retained the responsive mode of using them,[*] and the devotional postures they direct; both of these being observed, also, by the worshippers in the book of Revelation. (Rev. iv., v., vii., &c.) The apostles desired that their converts should "glorify God with one mouth," as well as "one mind;" with given forms in which all could unite; with prepared words, as well as affections duly prepared towards God and towards each other. Nor did the apostles omit putting on record their adherence to the old custom, that the people pronounce the *Amen.* (1 Cor. xiv., 16.) All this indicates clearly, and so makes good the presumption, that the worship of Christian Churches was, to a great extent, modelled, by their apostolic founders, on the unabolished parts of the temple service. Through poverty indeed, and persecution, there could be but little of the pomp and grandeur of worship any where but in the temple, where however they freely joined in it; elsewhere, they met in private rooms, and were under the continual fear of hostile intrusion. But had it been otherwise, had they enjoyed the means and full security, we cannot doubt that the same psalms and the similar forms would have been accompanied with a portion of the outward grandeur that had always pertained to them.

To the portions of the Jewish liturgy thus adopted into Christianity, enough new matter must have been added, to express faith in Christ actually come, to put all the devotions in his Name, and to offer prayer, or render praise, for the benefits conferred through him. New offices would be required, also, for the Christian sacraments: and there yet exist eucharistic liturgies, our own greatly resembling them, so ancient that it is not credulity to believe them the composition, mainly, of the apostles. Such alterations would naturally be made in the Jewish ritual, besides the omission of its fulfilled typical portions, to adapt it to the Gospel dispensation; they came of course, and are readily accounted for. But in the great features,—indeed they may be called great principles,—of a prepared worship, of reasonable and edifying ceremonies, of bodily homage, and the like, there is no ground for believing that the apostles innovated. If they had, they would have recorded the fact; and all these things would, like the expiatory oblations and other typical and temporary rites, be prohibited in the New Testament.

But, I repeat, there is no such prohibition there, no discountenance of them whatever. Far from it. Forms and rites are, in the New Testament, broadly encouraged: this let me briefly show. Two ceremonies, of the font and of the altar, were instituted by Christ himself, with the dignity and the efficacy of sacraments: the old rites, circumcision and atoning sacrifice, being abolished, the Church was not left with none corresponding with them, as she would have been were outward observances detrimental to spiritual worship, but these two are appointed to take their place. Another ceremony, the laying on of hands or confirmation, has the authority of the apostles, i. e., of the Holy Ghost; besides that it was used in benedictions by our Saviour himself. Similar divine authority there is for another laying on of hands, that in ordination. Even when miraculous gifts or blessings were imparted, ceremonies were used, such as the laying on of hands, and also anointing. As to devotional postures: we find the Saviour, St. Stephen, St. Peter, St. Paul in two cases,[†] and those who were with him, kneeling in prayer; and the apocalyptic elders, and other heavenly creatures, "fell down" before the throne, and before the Lamb, in the prostrate kneeling posture; as did likewise St. John, when, overpowered by his feelings, he offered the worship which the angel rejected.[‡] Some of the apocalyptic worshippers stand while uttering praises. (Rev. vii. 9, xv. 2.) And, as to the prepared mode of worship, the use of forms, there are numerous indications, in the New Testament, that it has the divine approbation, as proper for Christians. A form of prayer was given by the Redeemer to his disciples: as such, the Lord's Prayer, with the injunction to use it. The apostles and other assembled Christians "lifted up their voice to God with one accord;" (Acts iv. 24;) their "voice" as well as their hearts; which implies that the language had been prepared, to enable them thus to "glorify God with one mouth." The same remark applies to the apocalyptic worship, in which there are some of the sublimest and most magnificent forms. Singing is several times commanded; and without a prepared form, this duty cannot be fulfilled, either by an individual or a congregation: nor should it be omitted, that in this duty our Lord and his apostles united, immediately after he had instituted the holy supper; an authority and an occasion awfully decisive in favor of precomposed worship. And the apostles enjoined the use of the psalms, each of which is a form of devotion, and the principal ones in, perhaps, all liturgies. So abundant is the evidence of the New Testament in favor of this method of offering up our prayers and praises! So far is the spirit of Christianity from being ungenial with a ritual and solemn ceremonies!

Let me again advert to the other and remarkable encouragement of the use of forms in the New Testament, and add it to the foregoing arguments,—that the apostles and early converts continued to attend those parts of the temple worship which it was proper for them to join in. It is recorded, (Acts ii.,) that the disciples generally, fresh from the day of Pentecost, "continued daily with one accord in the temple," to take part, of course, in the supplications and thanksgivings there offered: though, as it is further written, they "broke the bread" of the Gospel sacrament "from house to house;" for whatever rite was distinctively Christian, they must perform in places belonging to Christians; but the general worship of the temple they freely attended: and the example of these pentecostal brethren, and its being placed, with evident approbation, on record in the Scriptures that "were written for our learning," as Christians, give us the complete and unqualified approval by the Holy Spirit, when his effusion was the most powerful ever known, of forms in devotional exercises. In conformity with this Christian and pentecostal usage, we next read, (Acts iii. 1;) that "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer:" their purpose, unquestionably, was to worship; but it pleased God, on that occasion, that, while entering, they should perform a great miracle, and then preach their Master's Name to the astonished people who flocked to see the subject of it. Nor did this Christian frequenting of the courts of Mount Zion cease with that extraordinary period. Four years afterwards, when St. Paul first visited Jerusalem after his conversion, he "prayed in the temple." (Acts xxii. 17.) And again, about the year 60, (taking the common date in the Bible, more than a quarter of a century after the crucifixion and the pentecost, the same apostle, St. Paul, "went up to Jerusalem," and to the "temple," "for to worship;" James and the brethren there regarding it as proper and a matter of course; and the whole relation of it indicating that it was nothing remarkable, but was still a common practice with the Jewish Christians.[§] And hence we may justly argue, that, had the temple and its worship continued to this day, WE might do the same, without contravening either the letter or the spirit of the Gospel.

One step farther I think we may go, in our deductions from the facts now mentioned. I have spoken of Christianity as *adopting* portions of the temple service. May we not rather say, that the Christian public worship was *engrafted* on the Jewish, just as Christians are declared in Scripture to be engrafted upon the Church of the Jews? (Rom. xi.) As the Gospel was first preached to the Jews, in each city or place, in order that, if they would receive it, the Gentile converts might be regarded as added to them, and not as a new body, it is but a natural inference that the Jewish ritual would be respected in a corresponding manner, and be no more altered than was required by the better religion now professed: a perfectly natural inference it is, that the temple worship, so much changed as to make it thoroughly evangelical, would be the general model of the public devotion of Christians. Such reverence for the older Church, and even for its temple, implies a proportional reverence for its liturgies. And these being the more ancient, were the stock upon which Christian liturgies were the graft.

Let me now briefly recapitulate the scriptural argument in favor of worship by a precomposed form. We find the Old Testament replete with forms; and not a few in the New Testament, which may also be said to be replete with them, accounting the Psalms to belong to it equally with the Old. In the Old Testament, we have frequent commands, and constant example, in their favor. In the New, we have a command and the example of our Saviour, commands and the example of the apostles, the example of the pentecostal brethren, of the apostles and these brethren both in the temple and elsewhere, and the sublime example of the apocalyptic worshippers. All these, too, are put on perpetual record, "written for those that should come after." What more can be required, to assure us of the mind of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit?

Thus clear it is that forms for worship have divine authority. And I have now to add, that such authority belongs not to the other mode of conducting public worship. Worship by forms is continually found, in one or another shape, in the Bible; but there is not one clear example of public or joint worship without a form, not one. I say, *clear* example, because in a few cases it may be held doubtful whether a form was used:[‖] but this affects not the argument. On a doubtful case, no objection can be raised against a practice so largely proved; to attempt to do so would indicate a weak cause. Whence however comes the doubt? from those who dislike the practice. The primitive brethren, we may well believe, thoroughly accustomed to liturgical devotion, and seeing nothing else in the sacred volume, knew nothing of such a doubt: they were taught their liturgies and forms by heart, and had them always ready for use. (Palmer, v. 1, p. 9.) Moreover, we have the yet stronger fact, that forms are frequently ordered to be used, in the Bible; but for public worship without a form, no order is there given. Our mode has scriptural example uniformly, and scriptural precept abundantly; the other mode has neither example nor precept on the inspired pages.

I will conclude with a remark or two on the allegation that forms are productive of formality in worship. This objection I apprehend to be altogether a mistake. Formality is produced by the weakness or depravity of our nature, making us laggard, reluctant, inattentive, in religious duties, yet satisfied when they have been thus heartlessly performed. And it is but too easy to fall into this sin in either of the modes of worship. We read or hear a form, without mental devotion, and are self-complacent as if we had fulfilled a duty. We hear an extemporary prayer, and perhaps attend to the matter of it, yet without offering it from the heart, or without offering it up in any sense, but not without giving ourselves credit for the act. Now what difference is there between the two cases? are they not both formality, and equally so? And does not the fault occur so frequently in each mode of worship, that it would be inconclusive to compare them in this respect? Nor can there be here interposed the kindling of the feelings by an eloquent prayer, so called; for the spirit-stirring of eloquence is not devotion; it is but excitement, sometimes merely intellectual, sometimes animal, sometimes both: and devotion lies deeper than these movings, and is disturbed by them. The heart disposed to be devout has to *contend* with these illusive feelings, and also with its admiration of the speaker, in order to attain that better emotion; and the heart not so disposed is but confirmed in its wrong condition, its formality passing from the cold to the ardent mood: for in both moods may that delinquency be found.

Let me further suggest, that forms should be a corrective of the tendency to the listlessness or distraction of mind which belongs to formality. Our Saviour declared, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," they have a spiritual and quickening effect. And though it would be impious to allege that human words are "spirit and life" of equal power, yet much of our liturgy is in the very words of God, and in due proportion all proper devotional words must be regarded as "spirit and life." And the words prepared by the Church, and matured by the Church, will be more purely and more efficiently "spirit and life," than those put together by an individual, however pious and learned. Rightly understood then, the assertion is true, that the spirit is IN the form; and if our hearts have grace, and do not let the grace lie dormant, we shall find it there. There is spirit partly of this kind in majestic ecclesiastical structures, and in sublime devotional music; they stir and elevate the heart, and, in the piously affected, give it wings to bear its offering on high: much more is this true of our august liturgy. There is spirit of a different kind in poetry, in eloquence, in painting and sculpture, in secular music. The martial spirit is in the sound of the trumpet and the drum: and he who feels it not when he goes into battle, must lay the blame on his cowardice. And the devotional spirit is in every right form of devotion; and if it awaken not the kindred spirit in us, the fault must lie in our undevout hearts. When the heart is ready, there will be no formality in the use of our forms.

And may it not be added, that those who make the sermon their chief inducement to be present in the house of God, fall into an error akin to formality? Worship is the principal duty there; and preaching is not worship, but only instruction and persuasion. And such persons set their edification,—so perhaps with some,—but far more generally, they set their gratification, above the tribute they owe to their Creator and Redeemer. Now, extemporary worship favors this unworthy propensity, by being unavoidably blended with variety in composition, with oratory, with the ambitious employment of "thoughts that breathe and words that burn." Very often, indeed, extemporary prayer is but a modification of preaching; and, alas, it is valued on that very account; the unreflecting admirer of it yielding thus to formality in the ardent mood. But forms never minister to this wrong appetite of the mind. They are worship only: and even their eloquence loses the exciting quality by repetition. And those who use them, and love to use them, and to use them constantly, have a great safeguard against the error of preferring the preaching to the devotional employment of the sanctuary.

My Reverend Brethren—

I pretend not, in the foregoing remarks, to have offered what is new to you; yet I trust they will not appear to be out of place. We have the outward provision for worship as perfect as the Church has ever known: let it therefore be our endeavor, both for ourselves and for those under our charge, to have the inward preparation as complete, to keep our hearts always ready to use it. With forms so excellent, and remembering that the spirit is *in* the form, how strong is the motive, for us and all ours, to cultivate perpetually in our bosoms "the spirit of grace and of supplications!"

---

[*] The expression "speaking to yourselves" refers to this custom, and may be rendered "speaking to one another," i. e., repeating or chanting these forms responsively. (Ephes. v. 19.) See Pol. Syn., Bp. Hobart's Bible, McKnight, Doddridge: and compare 1 Sam. xviii. 7, xxi. 11.

May not Mal. iii. 16, have a similar interpretation, "they that feared the Lord spake one to another?" It agrees well with the previous expressions, "serve God," "kept his ordinances;" and particularly well with the subsequent declaration, "the Lord hearkened and heard it," which is often applied to devotions, but never, that I recollect, to mere pious conversation.

[†] In three specified cases, if we include Ephes. iii. 14; or rather, in many cases, for this passage imports a frequent act. The three places give us St. Paul's regular custom, and that, both in public and private, out of doors, as well as in doors.

[‡] Luke xxii. 41; Acts vii. 60, ix. 40, xx. 36, xxi. 5; Rev. iv. 10, v. 8, 14, vii. 11, xi. 16, xix. 4, 10, xxii. 8.

The kneeling posture is two-fold, the prostrate, and the upright. Solomon used the latter, the upright kneeling posture, at the consecration of the temple, making both expressions true, that he "stood before the altar," and that he "rose from kneeling on his knees:" he had stood, or was upright, on his knees. Such also was probably the attitude of the publican in the temple, "standing afar off;" and possibly of the Pharisee, who "stood and prayed with himself;" but, as his prayer was rather a thanksgiving, he may not have been on his knees.

[§] Acts xxi. 26, xxiv. 11, 12, 18.

On this occasion, the visit of St. Paul was connected with the performance of some of the old rites, which were then abolished as duties, though not forbidden to the Jewish Christians. So gently was the levitical worship remodelled into that of the Gospel. Those rites were strictly levitical, yet were not prohibited; while the forms and ceremonies we retain are adapted to all religions, and are freely allowed, and the use of them encouraged, and even commanded. The observances mentioned ceased of course when the temple was destroyed, and would doubtless have faded gradually had it remained. But the general liturgical parts of the ritual were never abolished; they could be celebrated any where; and were intended, with the proper evangelical additions, to be perpetual.

[‖] Three cases are claimed, or apparently claimed, by the opponents of forms. (Acts xvi., xx., xxi.) They ask; can we imagine that Paul and Silas used a form, when they "prayed and sang praises" in the prison? Why not? they were ministers, and well prepared with forms, with forms for prayer as well as for singing; and the latter they could not do without a form. Or, that Paul used one, when he took leave of the elders of Ephesus? Why not, again? they were all ministers, and abundantly furnished with them. Or, that Paul used one, when he parted with the "disciples" on the shore near Tyre? Why not, once more? the "disciples" had been taught the prayers of the Church, (in the early periods they were committed to memory,) and Paul and his companions knew them well. Nothing but anti-liturgical feeling, founded on non-liturgical habit, perceives any difficulty in either of the cases: sometimes it amounts to anti-liturgical prejudice, founded on strenuous anti-liturgical endoctrination. Let this prejudice, or this feeling, be eradicated from the mind; and the opponent of a liturgy will find there nothing to appeal to, for his construction of these examples of joint devotion.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

ABOLITIONISM.

NO. II.

Now, Mr. Editor, for Church people, and upon Church principles, and Church doctrines, I shall try to show how upon this matter the instinctive course of the "Church" has been right, and upon what principles her ministers may base their "non-interference" in this and other matters of the same kind. Our Lord has given us the precept, "not to resist evil;" in various passages has he directed us to obey the "legal authorities." There is to this no qualification, "if they act justly." St. Paul has given the same precept of "passive obedience" to the ministers of the law, and it is well known that at that time they were unjust and idolators. And no one passage of the Scripture can be brought that authorizes resistance, much less rebellion or revolution. These passages are still plainly on the face of the Scripture. The false tradition and false doctrine of the age, explain them away. The practice of the primitive Church in those ages when Christianity was purest, before the union of Church and State, asserts the meaning of them. The non-interference of our State-free Church in "abolitionism," and other political movements, shows that we "instinctively" hold to the same views of their meaning.

The practice of the primitive Church explains them. Under the fiercest tyranny of ancient Rome, while the rights which the ancient Christians unquestionably possessed as Roman citizens, (see the case of St. Paul,) were most lawlessly and ferociously broken in upon, we never for three hundred years hear of any armed resistance to power illegally exercised; no Christian ever united in a conspiracy against a single individual of those monsters of iniquity, the Roman emperors. This is an historical fact—Origen challenges them to show a Christian conspirator, Tertullian too, and St. Augustine. Christianity *then* was a religion of suffering and of obedience. PASSIVE OBEDIENCE and NON-RESISTANCE were the universal law of Christian morals.

As proof of this, I shall just bring one passage. I might adduce hundreds. St. Austin on the City of God, 22d book, chapter 6: "The City of God, when it might have sent forth to war against the impious persecutors numerous armies, or rather whole nations of men; yet still it did not send them forth to fight for temporal deliverance, but rather, that it might obtain peace eternal, gave no opposition to persecution. Christian men were chained, were imprisoned, were tortured, were burned, were hewed in pieces, yet for all this they grew in numbers. It was their purpose not to fight for earthly safety, but to despise it in comparison with their heavenly Saviour." Every one too, may remember the eloquent passage of Tertullian, in which he describes the desolation that would have ensued in the Roman cities had the Christians merely withdrawn; and thence argues what they might have done had their principles been as those of the heathen. It would be no difficult thing to show that these were Church principles in the olden-time. Now they disagree with modern so-called Christianity, and to it are "sublimely ridiculous." And it is only in an extreme case, that their suitableness to the Christian profession flashes out upon us. Such an extreme case, occurred a few years ago. I have in my possession a letter cut from the papers of the day, from a "modern Christian," a missionary who was sent to Africa, detailing an attack upon his station, and how valiantly he fought; and so little sensible was the poor man of the inconsistency with Gospel precepts of a minister of the Gospel of peace *fighting*, that even in the midst of the details of a most horrid butchery done by him *in self-defence*, he quotes St. Paul's saying, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal!"

Now, Mr. Editor, I believe that these doctrines of PASSIVE OBEDIENCE and of NON-RESISTANCE do belong to the Church, and to the Church alone; and upon the instinctive perception of their truth, for though they have been obscured, yet still do they form part of Church principle, do I found the justification of the non-interference of the Church in the anti-slavery question, as well as in *all political matters whatsoever.* And upon them do I place the sure hope of the Christianization of the slave; an object which all deem desirable, and yet most seem to look upon as impracticable; so much has the idea of REBELLION, REVOLUTION, NON-SUBMISSION, and NON-SUFFERANCE of wrong and evil, entwined itself with the modern popular idea of what Christianity is.

How, then, is the Church clergyman to go among the negroes? Not with the sentimentalisms of evangelical piety,—not with the justification by *feeling* of the sects,—not with preaching, which to appreciate requires a refined literary taste and cultivated habits,—but with the declaration *as a fact* of the covenant between God and man, made in holy baptism, unannulled and unimpeached by the state of temporal slavery, (as it is declared to be in the above passage of St. Paul,) with its consequent train *of duties* and *of obedience;* with the Church doctrine of the real union, personally between Christ and the believer, and the worthlessness compared with that mysterious tie of all earthly relations whatsoever; with the holy example to set before the slave, as the model of his life, of him "who assumed the form *of a slave,*" (so in the original;) with the sense upon his soul of the shortness of life and of its being a state of suffering; with finally the doctrine of PASSIVE OBEDIENCE for Christ's sake, and for conscience, to a master whose authority is established by law, and of NON-RESISTANCE to that authority, even though it be vilely and illegally exercised.

These are Church feelings and Church doctrines, and looking at them as such, they give a great hope for the Church that possesses them, for the evangelization of the slave population.

I shall conclude with a few remarks. On these principles, and on these alone, can Christianity be taught our two and a half millions of slaves; on these can be taught the Gospel on the model of those times when Christianity was the purest. The ordinary Christianity, as inculcated by sectarian teachers, rejects and laughs to scorn these principles, and makes its boast that temporal freedom has ever followed in ITS steps; and truly wherever it has been, rebellion and slaughter *for conscience' sake* has followed in ITS steps. Hence do I argue that the Church, the Church alone, *can* preach the Gospel to the slaves consistently with the permanence of their present bondage, which the law establishes, and the constitution guarantees, and which therefore we on our principles cannot assail. And in that bondage we can see no obstacle to the Gospel preached among them: in that Gospel we see no *immediate consequent necessity* for liberation, even if they receive it in its greatest fullness and purity. And this we base upon that declaration of St. Paul, and upon the Church doctrines above laid down.

Secondly, I would remark, that if the Church does not take the Christianization of the slave in hand upon Church principles, "individual or private Christianity" will creep in; as they cannot by any power under heaven be kept altogether without knowledge. It will increase, and the result will be the same as it has elsewhere been with the Christianity that admits it the duty of man to avenge wrong. For wherever *Christianity without the Church* has been, there active and armed resistance to wrong seems to have been the principle, and the issue of that principle *rebellion, slaughter,* and *success*—for a time. The Huguenots in France, the Puritans in England, the Covenanters in Scotland, the pilgrim fathers, as they are facetiously called in America, all prove this fact historically, whereas *Christianity in the Church alone* can suffer wrong and bear it unavenged. For in the Church alone is the Gospel of Christ sufficiently manifested, and this is a Gospel of suffering. With much gratitude for the space afforded me in your admirable paper, and the hope that these rude hints will not be without their use, I remain, Mr. Editor, yours, with much respect,

W. A.

For the Churchman.

DR. BACON'S SPEECH.

We regard this document as one of no small value; and that for reasons which we shall presently endeavor to make plain. Being that it is a view of the present crisis, by one who represents we suppose a considerable portion of the New England Divinity, it is worth much. Being that it is precisely such a view as it is, it is worth much more. Nor can we, Mr. Editor, complain with you, of very much in it that is unintelligible; perhaps because we have lately been occupied with some matters, which have brought Dr. Bacon's main positions rather frequently before us. It is of these positions, then, that without further preface we purpose now to speak.

Dr. Bacon speaks in very alarming phrase of a coming conflict between two systems, of which he gives us some brief and certainly very imperfect outlines, and which he terms the Catholic or Popish, and the Protestant. We need not here stop to notice the misuse of the word Catholic, for we trust our readers will at once perceive it for themselves. Now what we purpose to do, is to examine the characteristics of these two systems which the doctor has laid down, and see how far each agrees with, goes beyond, or falls short of a third system, which in the end we shall speak of somewhat more in full, and which meantime we will call the Scripture System.

The main principle of Dr. Bacon's own system is Individuality. "Individual man stands before his God alone: he stands before the cross alone: and salvation is a matter between his own soul and his Redeemer; and in that question no Church, no organization, no priesthood has any concern." "It is a Christianity which says in answer to the question, 'what shall I do to be saved?' "Repent." "To the question, 'how can I be saved?' Spiritual Christianity answers, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.'" Now we are bold to say, that this may be Protestantism, but it is not Scripture. "Repent," is a part of the answer Scripture gives to the question supposed; but it is not all;—there is something more,—and that is, "BE BAPTIZED for the remission of sins."[*] Now this very command, this very injunction, with the consequences which are inseparable from the very lowest view of the act and doctrine of baptism, is, we are bold to say, quite sufficient to upset entirely the doctor's view of *mere* individuality, and no intervention between man's soul and God's grace. The very moment that a divinely appointed rite, like that of baptism, implying of necessity some person to administer it, and some form of administration, is interposed between man's soul and salvation, there is something which stands between "man's soul and the Redeemer." Turn and twist the matter as you will, the fact remains. The moment that Scripture has laid down such a command, and added it to the command to Repent, it has added something to mere individual action; it has commanded something which implies another person concerned, beside the individual himself; and,—Dr. Bacon, talking as he may please, about "human intercessors,"—it has done away utterly, his *mere* individuality. The case is so exceedingly plain, that we wonder how any man should ever have been able to escape it. The same holds true of his other answer, "Believe." What utterly un-Protestant preaching must that of Philip have been to the Ethiopian eunuch, if one may judge from its recorded results compared with Dr. Bacon's view of Protestantism! Philip preached "Jesus;" and while he was so preaching, and answering, of course, the Ethiopian's question, "what shall I do," did his answers tell of mere repentance, or mere belief? Let the Ethiopian himself solve the difficulty, who said while they were yet on their way, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be BAPTIZED?" Yes: in the short space of time during which he had spoken to him, that inspired preacher had contrived so to answer that Ethiopian's questions, as to impress upon his mind, that between his soul, and that Jesus who was preached, there must be interposed a rite, which he could not administer for himself: mighty as individual authority is in Dr. Bacon's wiser view,—and uninterposed as any thing can be between "man's soul and the Redeemer," on what he calls the Protestant scheme.

We ask then, does Dr. Bacon believe in the *binding obligation* on all who can receive it, of the *divine* ordinance of baptism? Does he believe that to administer this ordinance a ministry is needful? Does he believe that by this ordinance men are admitted into the visible Church? Or if he does not believe all this of baptism, does he believe it of any other divine ordinance, as the Eucharist? Or does he believe this, in part of one, and in part of the other? Does he—to put the matter on the lowest ground,—believe in the binding obligation of any ordinance, which each man cannot administer for himself? If he does, then where is his pure individuality? Evidently gone. For something is interposed between man and salvation outward from man's own soul, and that destroys at once and of course, the notion of pure individuality. If our first three questions were answered in the affirmative, he would have admitted "a Church, an organization, and a priesthood," which we have just quoted him as denying.

Again we ask: Does Dr. Bacon consider that view which St. Paul takes of Christian men—that is, of men viewed in relation to salvation—a correct one, when that Apostle speaks of them as "members in the body," or talks of all Christians together as a "temple built up," and "a building fitly framed?" And if he does, can he say that there is no "organization" in the matter of salvation?

We have endeavored to put all this, in the simplest and plainest way. We are aware, certainly, that it involves the whole grave question of a Church and Sacraments, and might demand for its investigation volumes rather than sentences; but we have only been concerned to compare Dr. Bacon's statements with holy Scripture, and to touch upon the question so far as they were involved; and we believe that our readers will now pretty readily admit the discrepancy between the two.

But be it observed, this is claimed to be the Protestant theory: and the *ultra*-Protestant theory it most undoubtedly is; and what we wish to have borne in mind here, is the fact of its involving so much negation; of its being such an imperfect and half-way view of Scripture; such a man-like view of it also. Taking merely those parts which relate to man's individual spirit, and what the individual does there, in his own strength or not, and leaving out of view all the rest. Saying, "Repent," but omitting to add as St. Peter did, "Be baptized." Saying, "Believe," but forgetting to add, as our Lord did, the injunction just cited, or the declaration, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no life in you."

We pass now to speak of the other system, which Dr. Bacon designates Popery; and the leading ideas of which he declares to be, "organization, unity, uniformity;" which sinks the individual in the mass, and makes him "only a component part of an organized community." Now we must take leave to profess our belief, that when the worthy doctor was talking here, he was talking in a considerably confused way. That he had mixed up and confounded, or perhaps had never learned to divide and discriminate, the Popish perversion from the Catholic truth. That with his present views and feelings he would turn away from the latter, supposing it to be the former; and if he should ever be led to search for the latter, would, without a good deal of clearing up of his notions, be in no small danger of mistaking the former for it. We therefore are here obliged to discriminate where he has confounded.

Now in the view we are at present taking, we should be willing measurably to accept Dr. Bacon's definition. We should be inclined to say, that Popery did elevate "the organization, the uniformity,"—we dare hardly add the *unity*, when we remember our Saviour's prayer at the Institution of the Eucharist,—the organization and uniformity of the *body*, to the exclusion of a true, proper, and scriptural view of the *individual.* An error, be it observed, which would be, just as one would expect beforehand, precisely the opposite of the ultra Protestant one noticed above. We speak now rather of the practical working of the system, than of its authorized teachings.

The common expression of the Popish idea of an *opus operatum* efficacy in the sacraments, will sufficiently illustrate our meaning; and that once done, thoughtful persons will readily carry out the idea for themselves, and apply it in other cases. We have seen that ultra Protestantism exalts the mere individual action, to the exclusion of the Sacrament: saying virtually that Repentance and Belief are enough without Baptism or Eucharist; and so getting rid of that intervention of any thing between the soul and God, which though Scripture warrants and ordains, it would fain reject. Now practically, is it not true, that Popery exalts these Sacraments, *in their mere outward reception*, to name now nothing more, to the virtual exclusion of Repentance and Belief? It is the *animus* of the priest and not of the recipient, that makes the sacrament available; and in this way it is, that in the person of its representative, the organization is so unduly exalted over the individual man, and his share in the transaction.

---

[*] Acts ii. 38.

The same erroneous principle seems to us to be evidenced, in the sacrifice of the individual rights of the Episcopate, to the organization of the Papacy: in the making obligatory Sacramental Confession, and in many other matters. While in the invocation of Saints and Angels and the blessed Virgin, we see the Scripture doctrine of a sacramental interposition of something between man's soul and the healing of the cross, pushed to a most fearful and unscriptural extreme.

Dr. Bacon himself furnishes us with another illustration: The injunction, "Do penance," instead of "Repent," is clearly a case where the act having relation to the organization of the Church has been exalted, to the undue depression of the act required of the individual soul. These instances will, we hope, sufficiently explain our meaning. And is it too bold an assertion to make in view of them, that Popery, as a system, does deaden and diminish the sense of individual and immediate responsibility? and that in this way the individual is sacrificed to the organization?

Such then we believe to be, in one point of view, the characteristics of the two opposite extremes of Popery and ultra-Protestantism; and yet we fear that Dr. Bacon was not so much looking at the Popish extreme, as at something else of which we shall soon speak; at least that he was condemning the very principle of organization as Popish, whereas it is only the perversion of it, that deserves the name.

Now while we believe that these two extremes have, do, and always will, more or less, come into conflict; yet we cannot think that the great and final conflict is to be between them. The conflicts of error indeed, never can be final in any sense; the only final triumph must be that of *truth*. And so we believe, that the final conflict will be between these two extremes, united by one of the curious coincidences of error that one is so constantly meeting, and *a third system*, holding the *via media* between them, uniting in itself all they have of truth, rejecting their additions, and filling up their defects. This is what we have called the *Scripture system*, and of it, we will now hasten to speak. We cannot, of course, hope to accomplish more than to present an outline.

Holy Scripture then, and the Catholic Church, seem to look upon men, Christian men that is, in a twofold view. They look upon them first as grafted into, and made parts of, the whole body of the faithful, and so in all privileges, and endowments, and high prerogatives of their religion, possessing rights that are shared by others; and in the intercommunion of the Spirit, in which they only live, having a common life, and an united being. This is taught us by all those passages of holy Scripture, in which Christians are spoken of as a "temple" built up into "unity;" as "a habitation of God, through the Spirit;" as a "body" made living and active "by one Spirit;" and other similar expressions. Expressions which Dr. Bacon must have strangely forgotten, when he asserted the very idea of organization as concerned with man's salvation to be Popish, and so unscriptural.

So then it is apparent, that in one point of view, and that a point in which we are looking on and speaking of the very highest and most wonderful gifts of God, all Christians are one living body, united in one Spirit, called in one hope, holding one faith, and joined to one Head. And is there not in all this, strongly implied organization and uniformity? Is it not strictly correct, in this view, to say, that the individual being is merged in that of the whole? That each single Christian is one stone in the temple, or one particular member in the body; and that if severed from the temple, or the body, he loses his whole character which he had as a part of it, and becomes a worthless fragment?

But beside this view, in which the individual is only recognized as a part of the whole; "only as a component part of an organized community," to use Dr. Bacon's own words; there is yet another view taken of man by holy Scripture and the Catholic Church, in which he stands forth distinctly and alone. This view looks towards man's responsibility to God, and the account which he must one day render Him. Here each member of the body, each part of the temple, stands entirely by itself. Each has had its own office, duty, endowment with life, share of privileges, and each can depend on no other for its account of all these things. Every thing here bears upon men as single unconnected souls, and nothing here can stand between each soul of man and God its Judge. When we say nothing, let it not be understood that we are for one moment leaving out of view the merits of the Redeemer; indeed, we believe that only a caviller could suppose it. Those positions are all sustained by the celebrated passages in the 18th chapter of Ezekiel; and we know of no other view of man in relation to salvation, than this, in which the Scriptures do not present him as standing with the interposition of some sacramental medium between his soul and God; between his spirit and the healing of the Cross; between him and salvation.

Now cannot we, even we, shortsighted as we are, perceive a fullness of wisdom in all this? That to bind men together here in the strictest and strongest union, even "the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace," that union which our Lord deemed so all-important to the spread of his faith, and its witness in the world, God should have made their possession of all his gifts and graces, a matter of community and united being: some rare cases only excepted, where all this could *in no wise* be had. And that yet to preserve the proper integrity of each, and to prevent each from fancying that because the assurance of salvation was and must be, somewhere in the whole organized body, he therefore was a partaker of it, should have rested accountableness on each individual; and made each soul of man, to stand single and unsupported at the bar of his righteous judgment. What other scheme than this,—we would ask it reverently,—could have so well effected that completeness of unity which our Lord requires, that unity which must result from an affectionate sense of brotherhood in holiest gifts, and oneness in the highest spiritual life, and yet not have diminished the awful nature of each man's personal and individual accountableness to the Almighty? We may safely answer, none.

Now we trust by recurring to what we have before said, it will be seen, how ultra-Protestantism is defective on the one hand, and Popery on the other; not Dr. Bacon's Popery to be sure, but *real* Popery. The one, seizing one part of the scheme, and pushing it to excess; and the other, doing precisely the same thing in an opposite direction. Both taking distorted, because partial, views of truth; yet both containing some truth, because pure error is, as Cudworth says, such a nonentity, that it cannot exist by itself.

It would be an interesting and instructive task, though certainly one to which we by no means feel ourselves equal, to trace the manner in which both these systems have arrived at their opposite points of perversion. We believe it might be shown from a careful view of the progress of events in the history of the Latin Church, particularly during the Hildebrandine age, and perhaps also the revival which took place after the Reformation, how every thing has been tending in the Papal system,—contradistinguished from whatsoever may be Catholic in the Latin Church,—to exalt and push to an overwhelming extent the principle of organization: which yet in itself and within proper limits is scriptural and Catholic. We believe too, that a similar view of the history of pure Protestantism, would show how the desire to revive and bring strongly out, the idea of direct individual responsibility to God, and the direct way in which in this view man stands before his Maker, (things which Popery, in its zeal for organization, had been overclouding,) was pushed to such an extreme, as to depress, if not to do away, sacramental media, and that organization in which such media are afforded, namely, the Catholic Church.

If the views we have now been advocating are correct, and we trust our readers have gone with us sufficiently to agree that they are at least in the main, then we think the conclusion necessarily to be, that Dr. Bacon is standing in a false position; a position in which, by denying the Scripture and Catholic view of "organization, unity, and uniformity," and pushing to an unscriptural and uncatholic extent his views of individuality, he is making himself an ally with Popery in warring against the truth. Nay more, that he is absolutely doing much for the advancement of Popery: for men, like pendulums, always swing from one extreme to the other; and if they are taught to deny all organization, all intervention between man's soul and God's grace, and to make the individual all in all, then when their eyes are opened, they are just as likely to fall a prey to Popery as to any thing else. Nay, they are more likely to become its victims than almost any other men. The coincidences of error are strange. And it is probable one hazards little in the prophecy, that Dr. Bacon and sundry of his *confrères*, whose eyes, till late in life, never rested on a live Papist, will some day pause in surprise at receiving from the whole body an encouraging and friendly cheer, to animate them in their attacks on the citadel of scriptural and Catholic truth. Indeed, it is against this only from opposite points, that the efforts of the two bodies have all along been, and are now directed; Popery; meanwhile thinking that she was combating Protestantism, and ultra-Protestantism feeling very sure that she was dealing with Popery; yet both all the while combating the same thing, each zealously though ignorantly advancing the others' interests, and both excellent friends, only a little in the dark.

So much then, for what we have ventured to call Dr. Bacon's main points. For such they appeared to us to be, after his speech had been stripped of considerable of the ornature,—we forbear to enlarge on this head,—with which such intellectual repasts are wont to be "decored." We may, perhaps, again recur to some positions and admissions in his exhortation, and make them, if our kind reader's patience shall serve, the text for a brief homily. J. W.

For the Churchman.

THE TEMPLE.

Haerent infixi pectore vulus. Æn. iv. 4.

"Peace be within her walls, and plenteousness within her palaces."

Mr. Editor,—A favor has been recently received by me, from an excellent friend, whose feelings have unfortunately become imbued with anti-Church principles. This taint appears less owing to any defect in his naturally fine mind, and unaffected habits of thought, than to association.

This gentleman is a unit in a congregation: so loose and ill defined, as to embrace any body; and so very "evangelical," as to throw its mantle of charity over every species of dissent.

The communication of my correspondent was excited by an article in the Churchman, which appeared "passing strange," and altogether horrible; and his objections were stated in a manner to indicate the general want of acquaintance with the fundamental principles of the Church, so prevalent among those who contemn and resist her venerable and time-honored authority.

It is not my purpose to enter upon a crusade against anti-Churchmen, or any persons cased in the armor of prejudice; but to throw out a few simple ideas, to be received and pondered upon by persons, like my esteemed correspondent, of strong and ingenuous minds, who may not enjoy facilities of information, or the ministry of a learned, sound and faithful pastor; one who, unmindful alike of the clamor of opposition, and the seductions of popularity, strives with heart and soul, in imitation of his predecessors, "the noble army of martyrs" and apostles, to feed his Master's flock with the genuine bread of life.

The great difficulty with a numerous class of intelligent and honest men, is to comprehend and admit the authority of the Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church to be a witness to and interpreter of the divine word—that Church founded by God himself, and of which "Christ is the chief corner-stone"—that temple "not made with hands"—"whose builder and maker is God"—whose foundations were laid before those of the earth, and whose lofty turrets rise for eternity—"the spouse of Christ!" This authority is questioned, and by mortal men, who cannot discern their right hands without her light: that light which is the Spirit of God! Could this difficulty be surmounted, the way would be plain; for the humble and teachable mind would recognise in the Church of Christ, a most tender and heaven-directed "nursing mother."

The authority of the Church is to interpret holy Scripture, and this she has done in her creeds, articles, offices, and homilies, so wisely, as to make it manifest to our uncertain and wavering comprehensions, the unity and simplicity of God's most holy word. None who study the Scriptures with her, can wander into "false doctrines, heresies, and schisms." With her creeds before them, none could deny the everlasting majesty of "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth,"—or the divinity of "Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord"—or the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit—or the trinity in unity of the blessed and eternal Godhead—none could doubt the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life of the world to come." So with her simple manual, the humble and teachable mind may avoid error after error, and pursue, without distraction, the heavenward paths of righteousness and peace. Suppressing nothing, she declares to us the whole counsel of God. As a faithful teacher, she has divided the year to suit the journal of her Great High Priest, and appoints and recommends suitable portions of Scripture for the whole period, strictly inculcating its prayerful study, and most studiously insisting upon the means of grace therein set forth.

"Faithful to Him who hath called her," she receives His "little ones" at their birth, watches over and instructs them with knowledge, provided by her Great Head, soothes their paths through life, and never deserts, either in prosperity or adversity, until, at death, she surrenders them into the paternal bosom.

—It is remarkable, that many who profess to deny and despise this heaven-appointed staff of our weakness, nevertheless avail themselves of her appointments when it is convenient, and not offensive to vain imaginings. The eucharist was instituted by our Lord at the feast of the passover, and it remained for the Church of the same Lord to define its exact manner and time, when it ceased to be an annual festival or passover for the month Abib, and became a frequently recurring sacrament; and this must have been by the inspiration of God, and not by his written word.

The Decalogue declares the "seventh day to be the Sabbath of the Lord thy God"—and the anti-Churchman professes to pray that his "heart may be inclined to keep this law"—yet he goes forth to his work and to his labor on that day, reserving the Sabbath until the first day, nor remembers that he acts upon the authority of the Church.

For the baptism of his children, which overpowering affection unites with reason and analogy to compel, there is the same benign authority, and on that authority, he leaves also undone the rites of circumcision, with various other usages, which obtained under the law.

Nor does the proof of Church authority rest alone upon these exercises of it, though they might easily be multiplied. She has existed throughout all time, and been always acknowledged by her Great Head, on the scheme of man's salvation. She was presented to us in the third chapter of Genesis, preserved with Noah in the ark, was with Abraham and his offspring, until more clearly revealed from Sinai in flame and cloud; and was never afterward lost sight of in the chosen nation, until "a greater than Moses" appeared, the Lamb of God—Messiah,—in whom she rejoiced as her glorious Saviour, Priest and King.

The Old Testament, then, furnishes her history, until the brightest day of her glory—the Advent of her Lord. She now puts on her "glorious apparel," and the Bridegroom and the Bride are delineated in the Gospels. Faithful men are called to "spread the glad tidings," and "preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Again; the Son of God ascends up on high, having the promise of the Spirit, the Comforter, and declaring that he would be present with her himself, until the end of the world. The book of Acts and the Epistles continue her history, and are filled with spiritual food for her nourishment and grace.

The storm of persecutions arose and tried her to the uttermost. Apostles, martyrs, and Confessors were swept from the face of the earth; but their faithful blood only nourished the Church, for she was founded upon the Rock of Ages!

Thus far Jews and Christians possessed the Old Testament in common; and what is now the New, was not found entire with any individual. One Church or person possessed one epistle, and another, some other portions; but teaching was by authority. Our Lord had left no written word: He was the Word Himself and he left his authority with inspired men to teach.

Having suffered every evil of adversity without reproach, the Church was next called upon to sustain more insidious temptations from the blandishments of power. An emperor becomes converted. A corrupt court adopts her emblems, and hypocrites and vain teachers usurp her sacred authority. This last trial was doubtless allowed by her Divine Head, to prove her high origin, and the same hand was put forth for her relief.

The first Council, after the election of St. Matthias, which was held at Jerusalem, with St James as its president, had settled various important matters, and now the venerable fathers were again brought together in the Council of Nice, to put down schisms and heresy; and under divine guidance, collected together and pronounced upon and established the canon of the New Testament Scriptures, as we receive them, in the same manner as Ezra had been commissioned to do with those of the Old.

In that august Council, the Church specifically stated her creeds and practices, the Scriptures and the interpretation thereof. To this period, we have it all on her authority, and remarkable does it appear to reason, that some should now be found to resist, while receiving the inestimable boon at her hand.

With watchful care, she continued to summon the wise and the good, the saint and the martyr, into Council, to rebuke this or that error by prompt reference and by precept; until, finally, at the last Œcumenical Council, all appeared to be settled and established so plainly, that the honest, simple and teachable mind, need no longer be led or wander into paths of error.—"O that man would therefore praise the Lord for his goodness, and declare the wonders that he doeth for the children of men!" It is more meet to bow in humble adoration and acquiescence, than to strive with the deep mysteries of God.

A recurrence to first principles and simple truth is frequently advisable, lest we leave behind some of the Lord's people. Let these be established, and though we may mourn, in this evil day, the distortion of some otherwise noble trees of the forest; the younger plants, the rising generation, will look to heaven; for the promises of God cannot fail, neither his counsels be brought to nought. He will be with his Church with increasing grace and mercy, until "her sun shall no more go down, neither her moon withdraw herself, for the Lord shall be her everlasting light, and her God her glory." Our hearts respond, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

A Dweller in the Temple.

For the Churchman.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

Mr. Editor,—While sectaries *among us*, are attacking with great violence the doctrine of Apostolical succession, as leading to *unity*, to *a Church*, and to *sacraments*, (vide Dr. Bacon's speech,) the Socinian Baptists at the West, who are said to be the most popular of all sects *there*, are, if possible, still more virulent. From the last number of a Magazine published by them, I extract the following:—

"The religious lie of the succession is the very tap root of the Papacy, and has been the Pandora's-box of that pestiferous and abominable delusion. It is the very mint of the Papal wealth, the golden mine of all her glory, and the perennial fountain of all her corruptions. It has builded her ten thousand temples, and furnished them with their golden shrines—their sacred wardrobes—their mystic trinkets, and all the mummery of her whole museum of sainted toys and worshipped relics. It has done more to pollute the earth with unbridled lusts, and crimes of crimson guilt, than all the holy waters and bloodless sacrifices of her untold delusions could atone for to all eternity. And till it is driven from the earth, by the tongue and pen of an intelligent and well-read ministry, Protestantism will be but an idle name and impotent assumption."

Again; the editor, improving upon the idea of Bishop Smith, of adopting the practice of dipping in baptism, puts forth the following, as a part of an article entitled, "Anglican and Roman Bishops have no divine right to ordain:"

"If all Protestant ministers are not ministers of Christ, because of the want of the imposition of certain hands, evidently all actions other than immersion is not baptism, and other subjects than a confessing penitent are not the proper subjects of baptism; consequently, any person merely sprinkled when a babe, cannot be a lawful member of Christ's Church, much less a bishop of that Church. Therefore, all the bishops of the Anglican and Roman hierarchies now living, have no right or power to ordain any person to any office in the Christian ministry. Their official acts, indeed, are not equal to the official acts of a baptized layman. They are constitutionally aliens from the spiritual commonwealth, and have no right to officiate in Christ's Church."

From the above extracts it would seem that the opposition to the Catholic doctrine of Apostolical succession is not confined to the vicinity of New York. J.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1843.

REMOVAL.—The Office of The Churchman is removed to No. 109 Nassau-street, up stairs, one door below its former location.

MAURICE'S "KINGDOM OF CHRIST."

We know few living authors with whom an inquisitive mind, interested in the religious principles and movements of modern times, and desirous to contemplate them in their connection with philosophy, history, and civil government, can hold more delightful intercourse than with Frederick Denison Maurice; and we wish, in the strongest terms, to press the merits of his work on our readers, and to urge them by their love of the Christian Church, and of Christian literature, to encourage the enterprising publishers, (D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway, New York, and George S. Appleton, 148 Chesnut street, Philadelphia,) who have brought it within the reach of American readers. A work of more originality and freshness, of more sustaining interest, more comprehensive in its views, more acute in analysis, or which brings one in closer and livelier contact with the prevailing religious systems, or is better fitted to disengage a bewildered mind from their perplexities, and to guide it to a resting-place adequate to its wants, may indeed be conceived and desired by those who ponder the religious phenomena of our age, but is, we apprehend, not easily to be found. The author has studied the Reformation historically, doctrinally, and politically, with the eye of an ardent admirer, and a profound critic; he brings out clearly its great earlier and later developments; seizes the distinctive principle of each, and traces it out in its practical operations; exhibits them in their actions and reactions, in their direct movements, and in the modifications which they have received from and imparted to the contemporary systems of philosophy and politics; separates in each the element of truth from its concomitant errors; vindicates for the Protestantism of each a positive character against some antagonist error of the Romish system; and endeavors to show how each has failed, by being separately maintained, and how all are harmonized in the Catholic Church, and find in their harmony the conditions requisite to their permanent and successful evolution in practice. How successfully all this is done is not here the question; for we are not writing a critical notice of the work, but only describing its aim and scope; but at the same time, we have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that, taken as a whole, Mr. Maurice's work is a realization of Coleridge's promised Christology, and wrought out in the best spirit of its projector. The author thoroughly understands, and therefore cordially hates, the Romish system; he does ample justice to the doctrines of the Reformers; while at the same time he sees clearly the sandy foundation and impending dissolution of the Protestant sects, and discern "the great struggle, of which our time has witnessed the commencement, and may witness the conclusion," to be, "whether the doctrines which the Reformers proclaimed are to be overcome by Romanism, to be merged in Pantheism, or to find for themselves a surer basis than either." Every Protestant sect appears to Mr. Maurice to be the witness of an insulated truth, which, because it is insulated, fails of the power and permanence which would be secured to it in the Catholic constellation; and we think that he has correctly seized the distinctive principle of each; referring to the Lutheran justification by faith, to the Calvinist the principle of the absolute will of the Deity or Divine Sovereignty, and finding in the Bible-only system of the Zuinglians a testimony to individuality, in the Methodist to spiritual influence, and in the Quaker to a spiritual kingdom. We think, however, that while he has eschewed the extravagancies of the Lutheran system of justification, he has also yielded too much to it, and has taken positions in connection with it, which, though far from being heterodox, or inconsistent with Catholic fellowship, are yet incapable of solid defence. We doubt, moreover, whether he be not deceived in supposing that he has found and preserved the element of truth which he attributes to the Calvinistic system, its *absolute will* of God being, as it seems to us, retained only in name, when represented as moving in conformity to the eternal Reason, or the immutable laws of justice, goodness, and truth. But, as we said, we are not writing a critical notice, else we might advert to other points on which there is room for diversity of opinion consistently with agreement in Catholic verities. One admirable feature of the work, however, we must not omit to notice, we mean its delineation of National Christianity; not legal or established by law; but such as asserts for itself an *independent jurisdiction* in each country or nation consistently with unity of faith and communion in all nations; in a word, Catholic unity without the Papal supremacy. The bond of this unity is found not in the Bible only, as interpreted by private judgment, which gives us a Christianity infinitely divisible, and of elements perpetually conflicting, nor yet in the creed of Pius IV., which confounds the superstructure with the foundation, and incorporates "wood, hay, and stubble" into the essential faith; but in the Creeds of the Ancient Church, which are at once the key to the Bible, and the symbol and expression of its fundamental and essential faith. A brief sketch like this does, we are aware, injustice to the author; but we have no room at present for any of the eloquent passages which abound in his work.

In conclusion, we will only say, that no man who differs from Mr. Maurice, no Calvinist, no Methodist, no Unitarian, no Romanist, will have reason to complain of the author's treatment of his views; for never, surely, was a more generous and liberal opponent; indeed, we are mistaken if many such do not acknowledge that they never before saw their respective peculiarities set in so convincing and attractive a light as that in which Mr. Maurice has placed them. Certainly *we* must yield him this tribute in their behalf; for, really, we almost think that it may fare with Mr. Maurice as it has with Jeremy Taylor, who, in his Liberty of Prophesying, has stated the cause of the Anabaptists and other sects so cogently, that he is said to have confirmed in their errors the very men whom he undertook to refute. And, least of all, will the Quakers have reason to complain; for they above all, will find in Mr. Maurice a serious, deeply thinking, spiritually minded Christian, who thoroughly understands them, and with whose temper they can cordially sympathize, even if not convinced by his arguments. And this reminds us, that the occasion and design of the work are explained by the author in the preface, by means of a dialogue between a Quaker, (emancipated from the system of his fathers, without having found rest in any other,) and himself; which is conducted with admirable spirit, and contains some faithful and happy delineations of character. One word more, Mr. Maurice's object is not proselytism; another; he eschews the technicalities of theology, and clothes his thoughts in popular language; and yet another, his work though having the same title with Archbishop Whately's, differs from it as totally as the sediments of the shallow and sensual philosophy of the last century, can differ from the emanations of the more profound and reverential system which is rapidly superseding it.

Rather to our surprise, the Catholic Herald, after apparently abandoning, returns, as below, to the question of "Communion in one kind." Our replication is subjoined, in the article which follows these remarks from the Herald:

The information asked for in the first paragraph of our contemporary is easily given. The Eucharist is truly and simply the Body and Blood of Christ: the appearances presented to the sight, and the impressions made on the senses, are the signs of that life-giving bread by which the soul is nourished. It is an enormous error to suppose that the Eucharist is not the Body and Blood of Christ: which is affirmed by all who believe it to be bread and wine, although attended with a divine influence and virtue. The distinction between the external symbol and inward grace will not help the *Churchman* out of his difficulty, since the question always reverts: what is the Eucharist? If he answer; it is bread and wine consecrated and received as the Body and Blood of Christ: his answer differs widely from the simple words of Christ: This is my Body: This is my Blood. The Council of Trent, or the Catechism of the Council, cannot be pleaded; for the general definition of a Sacrament cannot be urged against the plain meaning of those who employ it. A Sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing, or a sensible and visible sign of an invisible grace. There must be something presented to the senses; but it is not necessary that the object should exist in the form thus presented. For all sacramental purposes it suffices that the grace should be made sensible in some way. The appearance of bread and wine does not necessarily prove that their substance is present. We give our contemporary all the information he asks, according to the measure of our understanding; and we trust he will receive it in the humility of faith, and not be wise more than it behooveth to be wise, but be wise to sobriety.

The commencement of the second paragraph persuades us that the *Churchman* embraces the Tridentine definition, and is eager to harmonize with us in faith, whilst he rejects certain modes of speech, and finds fault with our received discipline. He admits the term transubstantiation as having a primitive and true sense, and apparently disputes about mere scholastic subtilties. Still he walks on slippery ground. There is no possibility of maintaining transubstantiation, whilst the change of substance is denied, and there is no choice left between the doctrine proposed by the Council, of the true conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into His Blood, and the enormous error of Protestants, who believe the bread and wine, accompanied with an invisible influence, to be the Eucharist.

In commanding the Apostles to do what He had done, Christ instituted a priesthood and sacrifice, which His command plainly regards. They were authorized to give to receivers the victim in both ways: but the positive command so to do cannot be established by a general commission having a direct object of chief importance. Where a secondary matter is in question, it is fair to appeal to the acts of the authorized functionaries, thence to determine the weight and character of these minor attributions.

The *Churchman* does not correctly view the process whereby we arrive at practical results in this respect. It is not by dangerous speculation on the mystery that we are led to administer the Sacrament under one kind. We see long established practice: we look to ancient examples: we then consider the sublime nature of the mystery as plainly proposed to us: and we are thus emboldened to act in conformity with such venerable precedents. What our contemporary tremblingly adds concerning the sophistical nature of the argument, will not bear examination. The point at issue is: what has Christ appointed? Ancient precedent and the positive sanction and judgment of the Church are safe guides in determining Christ's appointment.

Bellarmine in the passage quoted by the *Churchman* examines the scholastic question as to the amount of grace received, or the moment at which the grace is communicated, when the Sacrament is administered in two distinct forms. These things may be examined at leisure, after our contemporary shall have made his profession of faith. How, he asks, can the laity be sure that the grace is not suspended now, whilst the other species is withheld? This is taking an uncertain opinion as the groundwork of reasoning, and arguing thence against the public practice of the Church: to dispute which is downright madness, according to Augustine. Whether we receive the same degree of grace from one kind as from both, the Church has wisely abstained from defining; it being amply sufficient to know that we are not deprived of any grace necessary to salvation. Can the *Churchman* find equal assurance in his two symbols?

"If both kinds are not necessary to be received, why did our Lord deliver to his Apostles in both kinds?" Because it was meet and proper that on that solemn occasion of instituting priesthood and sacrifice, the priests consecrated by our Lord should eat of the victim: and because it was right that a privilege which might be at all times enjoyed, with due dependence on the governing authority of the Church, might be then especially enjoyed. The *Churchman* asks, why was it delivered to the Apostles, who could receive it only as a Sacrament? We answer, that the solemnity of the occasion rendered the communion of the victim in its twofold form peculiarly appropriate. Even now the consecrating bishop communicates the bishop consecrated in both kinds. For the priest who celebrates communion under both kinds is now required, not, as the *Churchman* says, as a Sacrament, but as the consummation of the sacrifice.

With views strikingly approximating to those of the Church, the editor mingles some caricatures of our statements. We have spoken of the communion under one or both kinds as matter of circumstantial and disciplinary arrangement; but we never treated the separate consecration of the wine as a matter which might be dispensed with. We have evaded no question, but, (be it said without prejudice to our modesty,) we have met boldly our adroit assailant, and fairly driven him from all his entrenchments. He asks us still *to prove the fact of reception*. We prove it from the practice and judgment of the Church, from the many examples of antiquity: and from the words of Christ which are applicable to the reception of Him under one species. "He that eateth me the same shall also live by me." "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever." The remarkable variety observable in the phraseology of John vi. serves to show that the mode of receiving under either species, is distinct from the essence of the Sacrament.

The argument taken from the modes of Baptism is unsatisfactory to the *Churchman*, as was to be expected, but it will strike most persons as a case in point. The question is raised as to what constitutes Baptism. Some say it consists essentially in immersion, because Christ commanded, and the Apostles practised immersion. The general public practice of the Apostolic age, is confessedly favorable to this view: yet special examples being furnished of different kinds of ablution considered valid in ancient ages, and afterwards generally followed, we argue that immersion cannot appertain to the essence of Baptism. In like manner we argue from similar facts, that the administration of the Eucharist under both kinds cannot appertain to its essence, because it was not always so administered in the early ages, and the contrary practice has long since prevailed. The promise of Christ, that the powers of Hell shall not destroy His institutions, is opportunely remembered in both cases: and if the *Churchman* can dispense with its aid in either instance, he is more easily satisfied than we are. As he does not venture to meddle with our examples, we care not for the reproach of absurdity with which his imagination is amused, whilst he finds himself annoyed by stubborn facts. It is only by distorting our words that he has represented us as declaring the use of wine for the consecration of the Eucharist to be circumstantial and accidental, whilst we spoke merely of the mode of receiving the Sacrament; and spoke not of the sacrifice, which requires the separate exhibition of the immolation of the Body and effusion of the Blood. Why does such a clear-sighted writer, with instinctive yearning for the teaching of Trent, involve the subject in obscurity by those mis-statements?

Can the Laity obtain the Eucharist in the Church of Rome?

To the question, "What is the Eucharist?" *our* answer is unequivocal, intelligible, and consistent with the nature of a sacrament; for we say that the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ under the sign, form, or symbol of Bread and Wine. The wine being, according to this definition, an essential part of the sacrament, we argue, that without the sumption of the wine, there is no communion of the Eucharist.

To evade the conclusion, and to divert attention from the real question at issue, *viz.*: Whether the laity in the Roman Church receive the sacrament? the Catholic Herald charged us with low sacramentarian views, because we made the symbol of the Eucharist to be bread and wine. We then asked him if the symbol be not bread and wine, what *is* it? His answer, which is before our readers, is equivocal and subversive of the nature of a sacrament. "The Eucharist," he says, "is . . . simply the Body and Blood of Christ." If *simply*, then not *sacramentally*; in other words, if the Eucharist be *simply* the Body and Blood of Christ, then the symbol is no part of it, and it ceases to be a sacrament. But a sacrament it confessedly is; and therefore being compelled to find in it a sign as well as a thing signified, our opponent adds, "The appearances presented to the sight, and the impressions made on the senses, are *the signs* of that Life-giving bread by which the soul is nourished." This, however, is contrary to *acknowledged* fact, for the appearances *presented to the sight*, and the impressions *made on the senses*, are the signs of bread and wine; and by making these *appearances*, and these *impressions*, to be the signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, the outward part of the Eucharist is destroyed, and its sacramental character is gone. And what is worse, the Body and Blood of Christ, according to this view, are, not mediately and sacramentally, or by means of an external object, but simply and immediately presented to the sight, and impressed on the senses; and if this be not, we know not what is, that gross Capernaum view which supposes the Body and Blood of Christ to be perceived by sense and not by faith; carnally and not spiritually; after an earthly and not after an heavenly manner.

If our opponent really wished to meet the question, we do not see why he should make a scruple of calling the symbol by the names which belonged to it before consecration, seeing this is done by St. Paul himself, and by the Roman Church also, in the canon of the Mass. But be it as he says, that the symbol consists of *species* and not of *substances*; still our argument is the same; for the species are two, *viz.*, the species of bread, and the species of wine; and since both are essential, either separately taken is no Eucharist.

It is with an ill grace that our opponent exults over what he calls our admission that the term *transubstantiation* may be taken in a true and primitive sense. There is no admission in the matter, but a simple reference to fact. The fact is, that some of the ablest divines whom the Roman Church claims for her own, yielding to the force of truth, have confessed that the sacramental Body in the Eucharist is *not the same* as that Body which was born of the Virgin, and was immolated on the cross; and if Romanists themselves thus apply the word *transubstantiation* to denote the change of common bread and wine into the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, we certainly can have no quarrel with them about the word.

With a still worse grace does our opponent upbraid us with scholastic subtilties, following, herein, the Arians and other ancient heretics who first depraved the truth by their vain speculations and then turned against the Catholics the cry of metaphysics! After having depraved the Eucharist, and robbed it of its sacramental character by his scholastic subtilties, and perverted the words of our Lord, "This is my Body," &c., to a bad sense, and so driven us to use his own weapons in self-defence, the Romanist coolly turns on us the cry of scholastic subtilties! And what answer did the Catholics of the ancient Church make to the Arians? We resort to this kind of argument, they said, in self-defence; in order to exclude false metaphysics by true, and to preserve in a good sense those expressions of holy Scripture which you have perverted to a bad sense. The same is *our* answer to *Romanists*.

Our opponent tells us that we do not view correctly the process by which he arrives at his practical results. We answer, that we view it just as he exhibited it; for when asked to state the reason of the practice of his Church, he first referred to the ground of the sacrament, and afterwards, and in a feebler tone, to precedents in his favor. We answer, also, that we have viewed the process as exhibited in the history of the Church; the disuse of the cup, as a rule of the Church, having never been introduced or sanctioned until long after the rise of the prevailing Roman theory of transubstantiation.

It matters not what question Bellarmine was examining, since his words are express, that when the Eucharist is administered in both kinds, the grace is not received until both kinds have been received. The truth is, he is endeavoring to repel the ugly argument, that if the cup is of no benefit to the laity, it can be of none to the priests; and in the course of his reply, a little after the words which we last quoted, he further says, that the Eucharist is received in both kinds by the officiating priest, not only because it is operative in both kinds, but because without the sumption of both kinds there is no sacrament! assigning the fact of the institution in both kinds as the reason of his opinion. Nor let it be said, that this is a private opinion, seeing Bellarmine, if any, speaks the general sense of Roman divines, and seeing the Roman Church is still a witness against herself by requiring the sumption of both kinds by the officiating priest. Again, then, we ask, if the Eucharist be no sacrament to the officiating priest, unless he receive it in both kinds, how can the Roman laity be sure that the same conditions are not required to convey the sacrament to them? To this the Herald gives the best answer which the case admits, *viz.*, the present practice of the Roman Church; a practice confined to it alone; a practice unknown to the Catholic Church for more than a thousand years, and the lawfulness of which is the very point in dispute.

We put the question to our contemporary why, if both kinds are not necessary to be received, did our Lord deliver in both kinds? Let us consider his answer. "Because," he says, "it was meet and proper that on that solemn occasion of instituting priesthood and sacrifice, the priests consecrated by our Lord should eat of the victim." Here we have an admission that the Roman laity, by receiving in one kind only, do *not* partake of the victim; which is in truth the very thing that we affirm. "Because it was right that a privilege which might at all times be enjoyed . . . might then be especially enjoyed." Here we have an admission that the cup is a special privilege, of which the Roman laity are deprived by their

Church; but if the wine be a separate privilege by itself, *and* an essential of the Eucharist, then plainly there can be no Eucharist without it. Because "the solemnity of the occasion rendered the communion of the victim in its twofold form peculiarly appropriate." Here we have an admission that the communion in both kinds is more solemn than in one only; and consequently that the present practice of the Roman Church is proportionably a degradation of the original solemnity. "Even now the consecrating bishop communicates the bishop consecrated in both kinds;" which proves that the Church of Rome is still a witness against herself, preserving the sacrament in its original integrity while yet she withholds it from the people. "For the priest who celebrates, communion under both kinds is now required, not, as the *Churchman* says, as a sacrament, but as the consummation of a sacrifice." The sumption of both kinds, says Bellarmine, is necessary *ex parte sacramenti*, to constitute the sacrament: but be it as our opponent says, and again we ask, since the reception of the wine is necessary to the priest in order to the consummation of the sacrifice, why is it not equally necessary to the people in order to the participation of the sacrifice?

Our argument, whether sound or defective, has at least the merit of being short and intelligible. We assume that the wine is an essential of the sacrament; not a *circumstantial* or an *accidental* matter, but *necessary* to the completeness of the sacrament: and thence we argue that when the wine is not received, the sacrament is not received. Now this argument stands at the threshold; and it must be met at the threshold, and receive a solid answer, before we can advance a step farther; for it is equally confessed by our opponent and ourselves that the Church Catholic has no authority to decree any thing contrary to its own organic principles; no power to alter or abolish essentials; and therefore if our argument be sound, the Roman Church, in practically declaring that there is a perfect sacrament without the cup, is convicted in the outset of want of Catholicity, of fallibility, and of error. Now there are but two possible ways to meet the argument: the one is to deny the premiss; and the other, to acknowledge the truth of the premiss, and to show the inconsequence of the conclusion. Our opponent *does neither;* he neither denies the premiss, nor yet does he acknowledge it, and attempt to show that it does not sustain the conclusion which we draw from it. But he says that he "never treated *the separate consecration* of the wine as a matter that might be dispensed with;" that he never declared "the use of wine *for the consecration* of the Eucharist to be circumstantial and accidental;" and finally he quotes John vi., to show that "*the mode* of receiving the Eucharist . . . is distinct from *the essense* of the sacrament!" Assertions so vague and irrelevant may help him to cover an awkward retreat from his old position, *viz.*, that the cup was only *circumstantial* and *accidental*, but they do not suffice to put him in a new position. Whether indeed they be any thing better than equivocation and trifling, both he and we must consent to leave our readers to judge.

Not less equivocal is our opponent's reference to Baptism. He supposes a change in the ancient Church in regard to the Eucharist similar to an alleged change from immersion to affusion in Baptism. We deny the fact of such change in the ancient Church in regard to the Eucharist, and shall call for the proofs as soon as we can ascertain the point which, if real, it may serve to establish. It shows, says our opponent, that "the administration of the Eucharist under both kinds cannot appertain to its essence." What does he mean? Does he mean that *the administration* of the sacrament does not pertain to its essence? If this be all, he may spare himself the pains of proving what nobody denies. Does he mean that *either species* does not pertain to the essence of the Eucharist? But if neither species pertain to the essence, the sacrament is gone; which is absurd. Our opponent must see the necessity of coming out from these ambiguities and expressing his meaning in definite and intelligible language.

Our opponent refers us to John vi., and talks largely of the precedents of the ancient Church. We acknowledge that John vi. refers to the Eucharist, and we hold ourselves bound in this matter by the public practice of the ancient Church; and we are therefore ready to follow him in both these appeals, as soon as we shall have helped him over the threshold. At present we cannot follow him; for we know not where he is, nor for what purpose he would make the appeal. The Eucharist, he says, is *simply* the Body and Blood of CHRIST; i. e., simply the invisible grace; if so, why appeal to John vi. and ancient practice to prove the fact of its reception by the Roman laity, when we granted in the outset that Romanists as well as others might, by GOD's merciful allowance for their unhappy condition, receive *the grace*, and carefully restricted our denial to the point of their receiving *the sacrament?* Does he wish to prove that the Roman laity receive the sacrament? Surely then he is bound to let us understand distinctly what the sacrament is; to reaffirm or revoke unequivocally all that he has said about the wine being circumstantial and accidental; and to say explicitly whether the wine be or be not an essential of the sacrament; and whether either kind, separately taken, be or be not a perfect sacrament. When he has defined his meaning on these points, and made it plain what it is he wishes to prove, then we shall be quite ready to follow him in his appeal to John vi. and the ancient Church.

Meantime lest our contemporary should misinterpret our motives and indulge in premature exultation, we beg to say to him, that although *we* take John vi. to refer to the Eucharist, we yet find in his Church small countenance for the opinion; many of his ablest divines having referred John vi. to *spiritual* eating and drinking, on the ground that if it were understood of *sacramental* eating and drinking, it would condemn the usage of their Church. If he doubt this, let him refer to Cardinal Cajetan's Commentary on the passage, and to Pallavicini, lib. 17, c. xi., where he will find enough to shake his dependence on John vi.; and where he will also find, that when it was proposed in the Council of Trent to anathematize those who deny that *the one species is a true and lawful sacrament*, the proposition *was put down*, and in its place the present "ambiguous and stammering" language of Rome (Trent, sess. xxi. can. iii.) was adopted. And to abate his confident boast of antiquity, we will merely commend to his consideration at present the words of his learned Petavius: "Will he deny that the administration of the Eucharist under both kinds prevailed in the times of the apostles? and continued for many ages afterwards in the Church? But if he deny or question this, he must be content to be reckoned either in the lowest rank of unlearned, or certainly the first of imprudent men:" and the still plainer and stronger language of Cardinal Bona, who affirms that persons of all sorts, clergy and laity, men and women, from the very beginning of the Church to the twelfth century, were communicated in both kinds; that the fact is admitted by all, Catholics and sectaries; and that no person imbued with the least knowledge of ecclesiastical history can deny it. To the same effect was our former testimony from Aquinas.

We cheerfully acknowledge the unexpected courtesy of our opponent in inserting a part of our first and the whole of our last article on this subject in his columns, and shall be happy to have the same reciprocation continued until the discussion shall have been finished.

PALMER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

Messrs. Swords, Stanford & Co. have published a *fourth edition* of this invaluable work; the present edition having the advantage of a series of questions, adapting the work to parochial instruction. We rejoice to see that a book so truly sound and Catholic is proved by experiment to be interesting and popular. Its merits are so well known to the clergy that we need say nothing to aid its introduction into Sunday and parochial schools; but to our miscellaneous readers who are not acquainted with it, we beg to say, that they will find it a most agreeable and instructive work, and very unlike the dry compends to which English readers have been generally accustomed. One of our journals, if we remember right, charged it with Romanism; but, judging from the bitter complaints in the last number of the Dublin Review, Romanists themselves are of a widely different opinion.

EPISCOPAL VISITATION. The Bishop's appointments for Visitation have been altered by a change of time for *the Astoria Female Institute*.

We have received from Mr. Winchester No. 1 of the republication of "Sir John Froissart's Chronicles of England, France, Spain, and the adjoining Countries," translated by Thomas Jones. It is printed in the usual style of cheap publications, price 25 cents per number.

ARCHITECTURE.—See the descriptions on last page.

DR. BACON'S SPEECH.—The remarks on it of 'J. W.' are worthy the attention of all—and not least, of Dr. Bacon himself.

We should be pleased to hear frequently from "A Dweller in the Temple."

We are desired to say that two, and perhaps three religious families, may be accommodated with board, at a moderate rate, in Middletown, Conn., one of the most pleasant and healthy places in the United States, and shall be pleased to give further information to such as may desire it.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are reluctantly obliged to withhold "Lenawe," in reference to Michigan; and an old correspondent's account of the "Beauties of Christianity" in Boston; and also, for the second time, "D." and "Virginia."

"C. is in type, and will appear in our next.

MEMOIR OF BISHOP GRISWOLD.

Brooklyn, May 25, 1843.

The undersigned, having, at the request of the family and friends of the late Bishop Griswold, undertaken to prepare a memoir of the venerated deceased, takes this method of respectfully requesting that all who have been intimately acquainted, or who have held habitual, or occasional correspondence with Bishop Griswold during his lifetime, would favor the design in hand by communicating such valuable and authentic facts and information;—especially copies of such original letters of the bishop as may be in their possession, and as would be important to the Church and the public, by giving increased fulness and interest to the contemplated work.

It is particularly desired that all information, which is to be gleaned from the stores of memory, may be as minute as is consistent with fidelity, and accompanied, as far as possible, with exact *dates* as to the times, when the facts communicated transpired. And, as the strongest desire is felt for the *early* appearance of the work, it is hoped that communications in response to this call will be made as soon as possible. Please direct to the undersigned at Brooklyn, Long Island, New York.

Contributors in *New England* will please direct their communications to the undersigned; "*Care of the Rt. Rev. Manton Eastburn, D. D., Boston;*" who will forward them to their destination free of postage. Other contributors will please direct to the undersigned at Brooklyn, Long Island, N. Y.; *single letters* through the post office; and *packages*, where it is practicable, by safe and early private conveyances; the latter, to the "*Care of Swords, Stanford & Co., N. Y.*"

JOHN S. STONE,
Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn.

☞ Editors of the different Episcopal periodicals are respectfully requested to copy the foregoing notice, with the prospectus of the memoir of Bishop Griswold.—*Christian Witness.*

NEW JERSEY CONVENTION.—We are happy to be indebted to the New York American for the following happy sketch of its proceedings:—

The Annual Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey, convened on Wednesday at Burlington. More than usually numerous delegations were present from the respective parishes. A procession, consisting of twenty-two clergymen in surplices, passed from the bishop's house to the church, where, after the usual service, the Convention proceeded immediately to business. This consisted mainly, for the first day, after the preliminaries of organizing the Convention were gone through, in receiving parochial reports and reports from committees.

In the evening an address was made by the Rev. Mr. Harris, Secretary of the General Society for Domestic Missions, setting forth the extent of that field of labor, its importance, and the inadequate supply of laborers and of the means to procure them. It was a remarkably clear, forcible and impressive address, which, we cannot be mistaken in saying, told upon the numerous audience assembled to hear. He was followed to the same general purpose by the Rev. Mr. Haight, of the Diocese of New York, in a brief but animated and well delivered address.

On Thursday the Convention resumed its sittings, and the bishop delivered his Address in the nature of a *compte rendu*, or rapid review of the state of the diocese, and of his various visitations and doings the past year, interspersed with reflections bearing upon particular topics suggested by what he had observed in his annual round.

Among these, in reference to the mode in which some new church had arranged its chancel, so as to bring the preacher nearer to the level of the congregation when seated, instead of perching him up in a lofty pulpit, the bishop expressed his decided preference of such a plan, as tending to render sermonizing more what it ought to be—a sort of conversational admonition and instruction, rather than a declamatory exhibition.

On the subject of buildings for Sunday schools, erected in some parishes at considerable cost, the bishop frankly stated that he did not approve, nor wish to be understood as countenancing, such expenditures. He was indeed, as was well known, more than doubtful of the expediency or benefits of Sunday school instruction—because it was necessarily very superficial, undertaken too often by persons not at all qualified for the duty, and mainly because it tended to discourage what he considered the true Church system—the establishment of parochial schools, under the supervision of the rector, in which the children of the parish could be thoroughly taught both the usual branches of knowledge, and the more important knowledge of their religious duties.

He objected too, to these school houses, as too often used instead of the church for the performance of religious services; a practice altogether improper, if not irreverent. The Church was the appointed place—God's holy temple—and there, where one existed, and not in any school house, was he to be worshipped.

The considerations of economy, sometimes presented for this practice, were scouted by the bishop as unworthy—and his conclusions were strong and earnest against the whole system.

The address was long, and portions of it quite eloquent, and all marked with the decisiveness characteristic of this eminent prelate, so remarkable for upholding the rights and power of his order.

The address will of course be printed in the usual Annual Report.

The Convention then transacted all its ordinary business, and having appointed the annual committees, and chosen delegates to the General Convention, a renewed attempt to amend the Constitution of the diocese, so as to admit rectors elect and discharging the duties of parish priests, to sit and vote in the Convention, was defeated by a large majority; and on Thursday evening, the Convention having completed its business, adjourned.

We are obliged to our correspondent, for enabling us to correct the erroneous impression produced by the article to which he refers:—

For the Churchman.

BOSTON, WHITMONDAY, 1843.

My Dear Churchman,—In your paper of May 27, you quote from the Boston Post, an article on the Methodist Society of East Cambridge, which is not only untrue in almost every particular, but is unkind to the clergyman and members of that Society, and somewhat discreditable, I think, to our Church, in casting upon us the character of proselyters. I presume that the writer of the article neither meant to be untrue nor unfair, and I am sure, that, in copying the article, you are not accountable for either of the qualities in question. I have said it was *untrue*, viz., that *Society* did not invite Mr. Vinton, nor any other Episcopal clergyman, to officiate;—the invitations, when given, have always been given by their minister. Mr. Vinton has never performed the service there on *Sunday*, nor has he officiated there *twice*. He preached an evening lecture, but did not set forth "the beauties of the Episcopal Church," but the beauties of the Gospel for the repenting sinner, and that most faithfully. Nor is it true that down to this date, "a greater part of the congregation have concluded to embrace that form (the Episcopal) and to renounce the usages of the Methodists." The minister has long been fond of our Church, and many of his people feel friendly to the same; but if the minister and his communicants can judge for themselves, the "large part" love "the usages of the Methodists" better. Further, if Mr. Greenleaf has "now in hand the completion of the important *change*," it is a matter wholly unknown to him, and to the minister and people at East Cambridge. And also, it is not true, as seems to be implied, that our clergy have performed the services of Sunday there on various occasions. In consequence of much ill health, the minister of the Society has been obliged to ask much assistance, and from his own choice he has invited Mr. Clark, Mr. Vinton, and Mr. Woart, of our Church, to preach Sunday Evening Lectures in his meeting house, on four different occasions. On one Sunday only have our clergy officiated there; that was on a Communion Sunday, and having been some time confined to his room, the minister of the Society requested me to officiate and administer the holy communion and preach, which I did in the A. M., performing the services rubrically and canonically, and preaching a *practical* discourse, "Let a man examine himself." In the P. M. Mr. Greenleaf officiated and preached. It is but just to say, that the best and kindest state of feeling exists between minister and people, and that though many feel most friendly to our Church, it is presumed that as a whole, they are more attached to their own. Could they sincerely become Churchmen, I should rejoice, and would do all that I could as

A MANLY CHRISTIAN.

MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE,

From the Spirit of Missions.

NEW HAMPSHIRE, *Drewsville*, recognised as a station; Rev. E. A. Greenleaf appointed Missionary, salary $150 from 1st of April.

INDIANA, *New Albany*, Rev. Edward Lounsbury resigned, to take effect 24th April. Rev. B. Hickox appointed Missionary from 24th April, salary $250. Vice Lounsbury, resigned.

Terre Haute recognised as a station, Rev. Robert B. Croes appointed a Missionary from 1st April, salary $300. Outfit $100.

WISCONSIN, *Nashotah*: the resignation of Rev. W. Adams accepted, to take effect 1st May.

Rev. Mr. Walsh of *Racine* transferred by his Bishop to Nashotah.

Rev. F. W. Hatch appointed Missionary from 1st April, 1843, salary $300, outfit $100, assigned to *Racine* and *Southport*, vice Walsh, transferred and Allanson resigned.

IOWA, *Bloomington*, recognized as a station, Rev. S. Sherwell, appointed Missionary from 1st April, salary $100, outfit $100.

MISSOURI, *St. Louis*—salary of this station reduced to $400 from the 1st April.

ARKANSAS, *Little Rock*—resignation of Rev. Dr. Yeager accepted, to take effect 31st March—leaving that station vacant.

MISSISSIPPI, *Woodville*—continued as a station, salary $400 from 1st April.

The Rev. Samuel Hazelhurst arrived safely at *Cape Palmas* on the 11th of February. He was received with much "joy" by the Missionaries. We perceive from a letter of his, published just as this number goes to press, that his first impressions are decidedly favorable.

CONSTANTINOPLE.—As late as March 19, Mr. Southgate had *not* received the instructions of the Foreign Committee to remove as soon as practicable, to *Mardin* or *Mossoul*, for the more direct accomplishment of the original objects of the Mission to the SYRIAN CHURCH.

CHINA.—Intelligence has been received from China of a date as late as *February* 15. No documents have been received at the Mission Rooms; nor do we perceive any information of a Missionary character. All was quiet at *Canton* and vicinity.

BEQUEST OF THE LATE FRANCIS S. KEY, ESQ.—Information has been received that this lamented layman has left in trust for the Foreign Committee the sum of $1000.

MARRIED,

On the 6th inst., in St. Paul's Church, Paterson, N. J., by the Rev. A. M. Loutrel, Dr. John O'Connor Barclay, U. S. N., to Anne Wilks, daughter of the late M. W. Collet, Esq.

CALENDAR.

JUNE.

11. TRINITY SUNDAY, and St. Barnabas the Apostle.
18. First Sunday after Trinity.
24. The Nativity of St. John the Baptist.
25. Second Sunday after Trinity.
29. St. Peter the Apostle.

JULY.

2. Third Sunday after Trinity.
9. Fourth Sunday after Trinity.
16. Fifth Sunday after Trinity.
23. Sixth Sunday after Trinity.
25. St. James the Apostle.
30. Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

EPISCOPAL ACTS BY THE BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.

Otsego county. Thursday, June 1. Confirmed 5 in St. Matthew's Church, Unadilla.

Friday, June 2. Confirmed 8 in Christ Church, Gilbertsville.

Whit Sunday, June 4. Confirmed 25 in Zion Church, Louisville.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR VISITATION.

Trinity Sunday, and St. Barnabas the Apostle, June 11, St. Paul's Church, *Troy.*

First Sunday after Trinity, June 18, St. James' Church, *New York.*

Thursday, July 6, Islip, *Suffolk county*, Consecration A. M., Confirmation P. M.

Fourth Sunday after Trinity, July 9, Tompkinsville, *Richmond county.* Friday and Saturday, 14 and 15, St. Ann's Hall, Flushing, *Queens county.*

Fifth Sunday after Trinity, July 16, Little Neck, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. 17, 18, St. Paul's College, College Point. 19, 20, Astoria Female Institute, Astoria.

Seventh Sunday after Trinity, July 30, Kingston, *Ulster County.*

Eighth Sunday after Trinity, August 6, Norfolk, *St. Lawrence County.* Friday, 11, *Hudson.* 12, Athens, *Greene County.*

Ninth Sunday after Trinity, August 13, Catskill. Tuesday, 15, Clermont, *Columbia County.* 16, Redhook, *Dutchess County.* 17, Ulster, *Ulster County.* 18, Hyde Park, *Dutchess County.* 19, Esopus, *Ulster County.*

Tenth Sunday after Trinity, August 20, St. Paul's Church, Poughkeepsie, *Dutchess County.* 21, Wappinger's Creek. 22, Marlborough, *Ulster County.* St. Bartholomew the Apostle, Thursday, 24, Patterson, *Putnam County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. Saturday, 26, Fishkill, *Dutchess County.*

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, August 27, A. M., Fishkill Landing, 4 P. M., Newburgh, *Orange County.* Tuesday, 29, Monticello, *Sullivan County.* Thursday, 31, Walden, *Orange County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. September 1, Goshen.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, September 3, A. M. Cold Spring, *Putnam County*, 4 P. M. Phillipstown. Tuesday, 5, Peekskill, *Westchester County.* Thursday, 7, Sing Sing. 8, Tarrytown. 9, Greenburgh.

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 10, A. M. Yonkers, 4 P. M. Tuckahoe.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 17, Flatbush, *Kings county.*

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 1, St. Mary's Church, *New York.*

Where ordinations or institutions are to take place, the candidates are expected to see that at least two Presbyters, are in attendance.

The neighboring clergy are expected to make arrangements for officiating occasionally, prior to the Bishop's visitation, and preparing candidates for confirmation, if there be any, in such of the above named parishes as are vacant.

Any other services, not inconsistent with punctually meeting the above appointments, will also be rendered with pleasure during the same period.

NOTICES.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The stated annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, will be held in St. John's Chapel in the city of New York, on Monday, the 26th of June, 1843, at 6 o'clock, P. M.

By order, EDWARD Y. HIGBEE, Sec'y.
New York, June 10, 1843.

BOARD OF MISSIONS.

The Annual Meeting of the "Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," will be held at St. Paul's Church, in the city of Boston, on Wednesday, the 21st of June, at 9 o'clock, A. M.

P. VAN PELT, Sec'y.
June 10, 1843.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.

The regular meeting of the Board of Managers will be held at the Church Depository, 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon, the 13th inst., at 5 o'clock.

WM. H. BELL, Secretary.
New York, June 10, 1843.

☞ This Society since the 1st of October last, has printed 2000 Bibles, 14000 Common Prayer Books, and 500 Octavo Prayer Books.

It has distributed gratuitously 509 Bibles, 353 Testaments, 4343 Prayer Books, 100 German Liturgy, and 37 Psalms and Hymns; has sold to auxiliaries, to the Western Diocese of New York, individuals and parishes, 631 Bibles, 248 Testaments, 6236 Prayer Books, 455 Psalms and Hymns—making in the 8 months a total of 12,912 volumes delivered from the Depository.

Will the rectors of churches kindly aid this institution by an appeal to the liberality of their respective congregations?

LECTURES ON THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

THE REV. MR. HEYER will repeat, by request, his three Discourses, delivered in the Church of the Holy Evangelists, on the *Mosaic Account of the Creation* as contained in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, in the CHURCH OF THE REDEMPTION, in Sixth street. The first on Sunday evening, the 11th inst., at 7½ o'clock.

New York, June 10, 1843.

PROT. EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.

A regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held at the Church Depository, 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon, the 13th inst., at half past 5 o'clock.

P. E. F. McDONALD, Sec'y.
New York, June 10, 1843.

CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY.

The Rev. E. Y. Higbee will preach in the Church of the Epiphany, in Stanton street, on Sunday evening next, on which occasion a collection will be made towards defraying the expenses of that particular branch of the City Mission enterprise.

Services to commence at 7½ o'clock.
June 10, 1843.

ASSOCIATE ALUMNI OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE P. E. CHURCH IN THE U. S.

The Annual Meeting of this Association will be held in St. Luke's Church in the City of New York, on Wednesday, the 28th day of June inst., at 7 P. M.

The Annual Sermon will be preached before the Association the same evening. Divine service to commence at 8 o'clock.

The Annual Essay will be read in the same church on Thursday, the 29th inst. Divine service to commence at 5 P. M.

A general attendance of the members is requested.

By order, W. WALTON,
June 10, 1843. Rec. Sec'y.

RHODE ISLAND CONVENTION.

The next Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Rhode Island, will be held in St. Stephen's Church, Providence, on Tuesday, June 13, 1843, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

AZEL D. COLE,
Secretary of the Convention.
Woonsocket, May 16, 1843.

CORPORATION FOR THE RELIEF OF WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF CLERGYMEN OF THE P. E. CHURCH IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

A special meeting of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, will be held at the Sunday school room of St. John's Chapel, on Tuesday, the 13th of June next, at 5½ o'clock.

By order of the President,
New York, June 10, 1843. S. SEABURY, Sec'y.

ST. SIMON'S CHURCH.

German Protestant Episcopal Congregation.

Divine service in the German language will be celebrated in the Chapel in Houston street, between Ridge and Pitt streets, on Sunday morning, at half past 10 o'clock; and in the evening, at half past 7 o'clock. Sermons by the Rev. Adolph Frost.

Friends of the Church who understand the German language are most respectfully invited to attend, and solicit the attendance of their German friends.

New York, June 10, 1843.

SECOND FRENCH CONGREGATION.

Divine worship in French, every Lord's Day, at 10½ A. M., and 7½ P. M., in the Chapel situated at the corner of Nassau street and Park Row. Sunday school at 9 A. M., and singing school for children at 3 P. M.

Our American friends are respectfully requested to make this known to their French acquaintances.

C. H. WILLIAMSON,
June 10, 1843. 35 Murray street.

☞ THE LARGE CHAPEL OF THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY is now open for Divine Service, under the ministrations of the Rev. Mr. Shimeall, every Sunday, *Morning and Evening*, at the usual hours.

N. B. At evening, (7 o'clock,) Mr. S. will confine himself to a series of Discourses on UNFULFILLED PROPHECY. Subject, next Sunday evening, *Apostacy of the Gentile Eastern or Greek Church, received in connection with the Prophetic Symbols which denote it, and of the* ANTI-CHRISTIAN POWER *appointed for her Chastisement.*

Episcopalians generally, are respectfully invited to attend. June 10, 1843.

☞ The Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Connecticut, will be held in the city of Hartford, Tuesday, 13th day of June next. Services to commence at 10 o'clock, A. M.

By order of the Bishop,
E. E. BEARDSLEY, Sec'y.
Cheshire, April 21, 1843.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

☞ The Treasurer of the Infant School attached to the Mission Church of the Holy Evangelists, gratefully acknowledges the sum of $95, being the amount of a collection after a sermon preached by the Rev Mr Walter, in Ascension Church, on Sunday evening, May 28—$5 afterwards added by a gentleman, making a total of $100. L. H. BLUNT, Treasurer.

New York, June 5, 1843.

ST. SIMON'S CHURCH.

The Treasurer of the German Episcopal Sunday School gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:

From Mr Cook—R B Minturn, Esq, $5; P Perrit, Esq, $5; S Cambrelling, Esq, $5; Baltus Moore, Esq, $5; cash, $3; cash, $2; cash, $3; W Duncan, Esq, $1; Floyd Smith, Esq, $1; D Dana, jr, Esq, $1; T C Butler, Esq, $1; cash, $1; cash, $1; Ebenezer Rogers, Esq, $1. Total, $35.

Also from the N Y Prot Epis Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, by the Rev B I Haight, 36 Testaments, and 10 Bibles.

JOHN A. VAN BLARCOM, Treasurer,
June 8, 1843. 290 Pearl street.

Donations for this object will be thankfully received, and may be left with Mr James A Sparks, at the office of the Churchman, 109 Nassau street; Mr A Banning, 270 Greenwich street; Mr T Cook, jr, 108 Essex street; or with the Treasurer.

N. Y. P. E. SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING RELIGION AND LEARNING IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, being contributions to the Education Fund of the Diocese:

From St Mark's ch in the Bowery, monthly offerings, Rev Dr Anthon, $18. St Bartholomew's ch, Rev Mr Balch, $59 63. Christ ch, Poughkeepsie, Rev Dr Reid, $37 50. Total, $115 13.

JAMES F. DE PEYSTER,
New York, June 8, 1843. Treasurer.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

Received from Charles Seymour, Esq, Treasurer of the Diocese of W N Y—from the Ladies' Society of Trinity ch, Lowville, $2. Zion ch, Rome, $3 36. St Paul's ch, Oxford, for distribution in the Western Diocese of New York, $4. Total amount, $9 36.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS BROWNING, Treasurer,
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, June 8, 1843.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.

The treasurer thankfully acknowledges the receipt of the following sum:—

From Trinity ch, New Rochelle, Rev T W Coit, D D, rector, $25.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS BROWNING, Treasurer,
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, June 8, 1843.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Treasurer of the Committee for Domestic Missions, since his report of the 31st of May, has received the following contributions:

From M S Marsh, Esq, Lancaster, Morgan co, Ill, per Rev Charles Dresser, half, $2 50; F Webster, Springfield, Ill, per do, $1; through Wm H Hubbard, Esq, R A in Richmond, per Rev T E Locke, from sundry individuals, $18; per Rev G Lemmon, $1 38; per Rev J Grammer, from Hugh Nelson, $5; Mrs Eliza Bruce, half, $15; Mrs E C Bruce, half, $30; Mrs E A Bruce, $10; Mrs E A Clark, $5; Miss Sarah Bruce, $40; from sundry individuals, $12—$117. Littleton parish, Rev W H Kinkle, $5; Western parish, Charles City co, $12 50; Mrs A Catlett, Port Royal, $10; individuals in St Paul's parish, King George co, Rev J Martin, $19 75; Trinity ch, Staunton, $4 52; Roanoke parish, Halifax co, $5 50; Raleigh parish, Amelia co, $14; St Thomas' ch, Orange co, $50 75; Ware ch, Gloucester co, $25 50; St James' ch, Mecklenberg co, $23 50; received through Edmund Wilcox, Esq, R A in Phil, Quin coll in Christ ch, Vicksburgh, for missions in Mississippi, $34; annual subscription of Mrs Cox, half, $2 50; Trinity ch, Washington, D C, $30; Sunday school of Church of the Ascension, Phil, half, $7 59; Missionary Society of All Saints' ch, and Emmanuel chapel, Phil co, for Bishop Kemper's mission, $40; do do, to be added to Quin coll, $0 50; Monthly offering of St James' ch, Lancaster, half, $52 16; the same from the same, $11 02; Quin coll of the same, half, $17 50; Rev W N Diehl, $8; St John's ch, Carlisle, $15; St Andrew's ch, Springville, $2 50; St Paul's, Minture, $1 95; Trinity ch, Pittsburg, half, $36 83; Female Missionary Society of St Andrew's ch, Mt Holly, $21 73; George W Taylor, treas, &c, half, $2 50; received through Charles Seymour, Esq, treas of Western New York, from Zion ch, Greene, $5; Trinity ch, Utica, $1; Trinity ch, Lowville, $4 50; St Thomas' ch, Bath, $3 50; St Paul's ch, Stafford, $2; Christ ch, Binghamton, $10; Christ ch, Manlius, $5; Jordan and Montezuma, $1 06; Angelica, $3; Grace ch, Lockport, $6; St Paul's ch, Buffalo, $55; St John's ch, Honeoye Falls, $2; from the same, the following trust funds, viz., St Stephen's ch, New Hartford, for Painesville, O, $2; St Paul's ch, Buffalo, for Sandusky City, O, $38; Grace ch, Utica, for Akron, $0 50; St Paul's ch, Buffalo, for Painesville, $20; St John's ch, Canandaigua, for do, $5; St John's, Canandaigua, for Akron, $5—$168 56. St Paul's ch, Waddington, N Y, half, $2 50; Church of the Ascension, Fall River, Mass, for Akron, O, $10; the same, for general purposes, $1; a lady of St John's ch, Portsmouth, N H, for Bishop Chase, $30; St James' ch, New London, Ct, for Painesville, O, $20; St Michael's ch, Litchfield, Ct, of which $10 is for Painesville, O, $25. Total, $854 71.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
At the store of Swords, Stanford & Co,
June 8, 1843. 139 Broadway, New York.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, since last report, 31st ult:

Through W H Hubbard, Esq, R A, Richmond, Va, from St Paul's ch, Goochland, $18 50; church at Columbia, per Rev W H Wilmer, $62 50; Mrs Anne S Nesbitt, per Thomas E Locke, half, $5; Mr Wm M Bagly, for Africa, half, $1 15; R A Atkinson, do, half, $2 50; Mrs A Ingram, do, half, $1 50; Mr Whittle, do, half, $1 50; Mr J E Locke, do, half, $2 50; Mr R Nelson, do, half, $2 50; Miss Mary M Marshall, half, $0 12; Robt Donthols, half, $1 25; Master Edward Lee, for Africa, $0 55; through Rev S Grammar, Antrim parish, Va, John R Lee, half, $1; Mrs E M Lee, half, $2; Col H Cabaniss, $1; Mrs Lucy M Nelson, half, $2 50; Mrs Eliza Bruce, half, $15; Mrs Fanny Chalmers, half, $0 50; Miss Polly Green, $0 25; Mrs F Green, $1; Miss Mary J Smith, half, $1; Miss Ellen C Bruce, half, $30; Mrs E A Boman, half, $0 50; Mrs Sarah F Wanhop, half, $0 50; Miss Sarah Bruce, $35; Mr J C Bruce, for Africa, $30; by Rev W H Kinkle, fm Littleton parish, $32 62; by Rev Mr Leavitt, from Western parish, Charles City co, half, $12 50; by Rev Wm Friend, from Mrs A Catlett, Port Royal, half, $10; by Rev R K Mead, from Mrs Sarah Gilmer, $10; Mrs L A Minor, $10; Col Thomas Macon, $5; Mrs M J Davis, $3; Mrs Penill, $2 50; T J Randolph, $2 50; Mr C J Merriweather, $1; Mrs L Minor, $4 50; Mrs G Tucker, $0 50; several children, $0 35; by Rev Mr Cole, for Africa, St Stephen's ch, Culpepper co, $11 50; St James' ch, do, $11 50; by Rev J Fowles, for Cavally station, from James A Reed, $4; Sally and Louisa Tyler, $4 25; by Rev John Martin, St Paul's ch, King George co, Mrs Martha Stuart and family, half, $3 50; Miss Jane Park, $2 50; Mrs Julia C Stuart, $2 50; Dr R H Stuart, $2 50; Dr A B Hooe, $1 50; Mrs Lucy F Hooe, $1 50; Miss Lucy B Hooe, $0 50; A B Hooe, $0 50; Mrs L M Grayson, $1; Mrs Maria Stuart, $1; Mr M Lomax, $1 50; Mrs A Stuart, $0 50; Mrs M E Martin, $0 50; Henry B Martin, $0 12; Ellen D Martin, $0 13; by Rev F D Goodwin, from Trinity ch, Staunton, $50 96; Sunday school of do, half, $4 52; by Rev J T Clarke, from Roanoke parish, Halifax co, half, $5 50; by Rev P F Berkley, from Raleigh parish, Amelia co, $15; by Rev J Ernest, from St Thomas' ch, Orange co, half, $17 95; congregation, Louisa co, half, $32 80; by Rev Mr Chisholme, from Mrs Mary Conrad, half, Africa, half China, $10; by Rev Charles Mann, from Ware ch, Gloucester co, half, $25 50; St James' ch, Mecklenberg co, half, $23 50; St Ann and South Farnham parishes, half, proceeds of Mobile Bank note, $5—$2 05—$553 07. From M S Marsh, Esq, Lancaster, Morgan co, Illinois, per Rev Charles Dresser, half, $2 50; St Paul's ch, Burlington, Vt, collection for foreign missions, per Rt Rev Bishop Hopkins, $8 75; through E Wilcox, R A, Phil, Miss Cox, Phil, annual subscription, half, $2 50; Trinity ch, Washington City, for Rev C Gillett's mission, Texas, $25; Sunday school of the Church of the Ascension, Phil, half, $7 59; St James' ch, Lancaster, Pa, per Rev Mr Bowman, for Africa, $12; St James' ch, do, Quin coll, half, $17 50; do do, monthly offerings, half, $52 17; do, S S contribution for Africa, $18 20; St John's ch, Norristown, Pa, per Rev Mr Stem, $12; Trinity ch, Pittsburg, Pa, per Rev Dr Upfold, for Africa, $10; do do, Quin coll, half, $36 84; Female Missionary Society of Mt Holly, N J, per Mrs Eliza Kempton, sec'y, for Rev Mr Hazlehurst's mission, Africa, $2; do do, for foreign missions generally, $5 50; female Sunday school of St Andrew's ch, Mt Holly, for Rev Mr Hazlehurst's mission, $4 22; offerings of class 15, St Paul's ch Sunday school, Cincinnati, O, for tracts in Greece, $1; G W Taylor, treasurer, $2 50—$209 02. Through C Seymour, Esq, R A for Western New York, as follows: Grace ch, Lockport, $3; Zion ch, Rome, $3 89; Christ ch, Manlius, $5; St Stephen's ch, New Hartford, $3; St John's ch, Honeoye Falls, $2; S S of St Mark's ch, Le Roy, for mission to Africa, $10; Ladies' Sewing Society of Christ ch, Binghamton, for Cape Palmas, W Africa, $4; Mrs C Morgan, for do, $1—$31 89. Through B Howard, Esq, R A, Boston, from St Andrew's ch, Hanover, for Africa, $25; from Ch of the Ascension, Fall River, $6—$31. From St Paul's ch, Waddington, New York, half, $2 50. Total, $838 73.

F. S. WINSTON,
New York, June 7, 1843. Acting Treasurer.

JUST PUBLISHED,
NO. VI. OF THE
ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,
EDITED BY REV. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D.D.

THIS splendid work is beautifully printed on paper of the very best quality, and will be embellished with upward of seven hundred fine engravings on wood, principally after the old masters, and will, when complete, form the most magnificent volume ever issued from the American press. Among the illustrations of the present number are, The Resurrection. *Rubens.* The Good Shepherd. *Murillo.* Peter visiting Dorcas. *Le Sueur.* Mother and Child. *Raffaelle.* The Ascension. *Rubens.* Descent of the Holy Ghost. *Raffaelle.* Christ walking on the sea. *P. Gotting.* Peter and John at Emmaus. *Le Brun.*—&c.

To be completed in twenty numbers. Published semi-monthly, by
H. W. HEWET, 281 Broadway,
June 10. Price 31¼ cents.

ORGAN MANUFACTORY.
ANTHONY-STREET, NEW YORK.

THE subscriber manufactures all kinds and sizes of Church and Parlor Organs, of improved construction, superiority of tone, and at extremely moderate and advantageous terms.

Also, those truly useful organs; possessing Barrel action in addition to the usual finger keys; by which Psalmody is performed in the first style of execution, and rendering this noble instrument perfectly available in Country Churches where Organists cannot be procured.

FOR SALE,

Several Parlor Organs, varying from $200 upwards.

Also, Church Organs, of great volume of tone, from $300 upwards.

Also, a large Church Organ, with two sets of keys, fourteen Stops, Pedals, Swell, Choir Bass, &c., in elegant white case, of classical design—10 feet wide, 15 feet high.

GEORGE JARDINE,
May 27—yly Organ Builder.

JUST PUBLISHED,
PAROCHIAL SERMONS,
BY JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B. D.,

Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. The six volumes of London edition are printed in two handsome volumes octavo, upwards of 600 pages each, $5.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Of Mr. Newman's Sermons it may be safely said, that they are adapted to the besetting sins of the age; that the author traces these with a masterly hand to the most secret springs of intellectual pride; and that he explains and enforces the great principles and duties of Evangelical holiness, with a grace and simplicity of style, and onction of manner, which are seldom surpassed. We therefore heartily commend his Sermons to our readers, and earnestly hope that they may find their way into every family."—*The Churchman.*

"As a compendium of Christian duty, these sermons will be read by people of all denominations. As models of style, they will be valued by writers in every department of literature."—*U. S. Gazette.*

"These Sermons must eventually be received and quoted as among the Standard Theological Writings of this century; and that too within the time of this generation."—*Philadelphia Saturday Post.*

"They bear the marks of an original and highly Catholic mind; and many of them breathe a deep devotional spirit."—*Albany Argus.*

ALSO JUST READY,
THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST;
Or, Hints respecting the Principles, Constitution, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church.
BY FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A.

Chaplain of Guy's Hospital, Professor of English Literature and History, King's College, London. In one elegant octavo volume of 500 pages, uniform in style with Newman's Sermons, Palmer on the Church, &c. $2 50.

As Mr. Maurice is yet unknown to many readers on this side of the Atlantic, we may infer his standing from a remark of the London Christian Remembrancer on a volume of his Sermons recently published: "It is a volume which ranks with those of Newman and Manning; for originality of thought, liveliness of address and illustration, we know no preaching better than this author's."

D. APPLETON & CO.,
PUBLISHERS,
June 3—2tis 200 Broadway,

IMPORTATION OF EUROPEAN BOOKS.
D. APPLETON & CO.,
200 Broadway, New York,

RESPECTFULLY inform the literary public, that the branch of their house in London, No. 16 Little Britain, has recently been placed under the management of a person of literary attainments, and they invite the attention of the friends of literature to the important advantages the establishment affords for the importation of Books specially ordered. Among the great variety of publications abroad, comparatively few are for sale in this country. A great inconvenience is therefore obviated by this arrangement, as any person may leave his order for any particular work, and, by the rapid communication of steamers, the book is at hand in a few weeks.

Professors and Students of Theology, Law, and Medicine—Architects, Mechanics, and all who are unable to procure foreign books in our own country, may, for the small commission of ten per cent. on the cost, procure any work published in any part of Europe.

Books for incorporated institutions will be imported free of duty.

D. A. & CO. have, in addition to their branch in London, an agent in Leipsic for the supply of all orders for Books published throughout Germany; also in Brussels, Paris, Florence, and Madrid; so that they are prepared to execute, with great fidelity and promptness, all orders intrusted to their care from any portion of the Continental Book Market.

The necessity of such facilities for a speedy supply of Books from the great Book Marts of Europe, has long been felt. The advantages which they offer to Literary Institutions, Professional Gentlemen, and the Literary Public at large, all will acknowledge.

D. A. & CO. are constantly receiving Old Books in every department of Literature, Science, and Arts. The rare and curious works embraced in this collection may not be known to many who visit our city—comprising a variety of illuminated Missals, black letter tomes, &c. Bibliophiles, and those who have a relish for quaint books of past ages, will do well to call.

A Catalogue of the modern English Books for sale is now ready.

☞ Orders intended for the steamer of 1st of the month, should be handed in by 3 o'clock the day previous; and the like for steamer of the 19th.

June 3—2tis

FISHKILL ACADEMY.

THE REV. WILLIAM H. HART, having taken charge of the Academy in the village of Fishkill, and occupying a spacious and commodious house in a pleasant part of the village, is disposed to receive four or five pupils into his family as boarders, who will receive the benefit of his private instructions, in addition to the daily exercises of the Academy. Classical scholars of 12 years old and upward would be preferred. The pleasantness and advantages of this village, it is presumed, are too well known to need comment.

TERMS.—For Board and Tuition, during the term of 10 months, $150, payable semi-annually in advance. The above charge will include all expenses, with the exception of books, stationary, and washing.

May 27—4t

PARISH LIBRARY, 13 vols—viz:

VOL. 1, Leslie and West.
Vol. 2, Sumner on Preaching.
Vol. 3, Jewell's Apology.
4, Clement's Epistles.
5, Gibson's Letters.
6, Sherlock's Discourses.
7, Sumner on Matthew and Mark.
8, and 9, Works on Episcopacy.
10, Jebb's Kempis.
11, Walton's Lives.
12, Burnett's Lives.
13. Sumner on St. Luke. Fresh bound in cloth, $8.

J. A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore,
May 27. 109 Nassau-street.

POETRY.

CONFIRMATION.

Pledged was their faith in infancy: but now
When opening years the reasoning soul reveal,
Before yon Altar's rails behold they kneel,
Ingenuous youths and maidens! There they bow
The modest head, and there the early vow
With words of solemn CONFIRMATION seal,
And on their brow the hand CONFIRMING feel
Of CHRIST's High Minister. O GOD, do Thou
Save and defend Thy children! Gracious LORD,
Father, Thy hand be o'er, Thy Spirit's grace
Be ever with them, and Thy powerful Word
Their Light and Leader! Awful is the race
Before them set, with toil and peril stored,
And steep the pathway to behold Thy face!

Bishop Mant's Musings.

SONNET,

ON VIEWING MY MOTHER'S PICTURE.

By the author of the Life of Burke, Goldsmith, &c.

How warms the heart when dwelling on that face,
Those lips that mine a thousand times have prest,
The swelling source that nurture gav'st her race,
Where found my infant head its downiest rest!
How in those features aim to trace my own,
Cast in a softer mould my being see;
Recall the voice that sooth'd my hapless moan,
The thoughts that sprang for scarcely aught save me;
That shaped and formed me; gave me to the day,
Bade in her breast absorbing love arise;
O'er me a ceaseless tender care display,
For weak all else to thee maternal ties!
This debt of love but One may claim; no other
Such self-devotion boasts, save thee, my Mother!

THE NECESSITY OF SACRAMENTS TO THE PARTICIPATION OF CHRIST.

It greatly offendeth, that some, when they labor to show the use of the holy sacraments, assign unto them no end but only to teach the mind, by other senses, that which the Word doth teach by hearing. Whereupon, how easily neglect and careless regard of so heavenly mysteries may follow, we see in part by some experience had of those men with whom that opinion is most strong. For where the word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition and more full explication any thing we have to learn, if all the benefit we reap by sacraments be instruction, they which at all times have opportunity of using the better mean to that purpose, will surely hold the worse in less estimation. And unto infants, which are not capable of instruction, who would not think it a mere superfluity that any sacrament is administered, if to administer the sacraments be but to teach receivers what God doth for them? There is of sacraments therefore undoubtedly some other more excellent and heavenly use.

Let respect be had to the duty which every communicant doth undertake, and we may well determine concerning the use of sacraments, that they serve as bonds of obedience to God, strict obligations to the mutual exercise of Christian charity, provocations to godliness, preservations from sin, memorials of the principal benefits of Christ; respect the time of their institution, and it thereby appeareth that God hath annexed them for ever unto the New Testament, as other rites were before with the Old; regard the weakness which is in us, and they are warrants for the more security of our belief; compare the receivers of them with such as receive them not, and sacraments are marks of distinction to separate God's own from strangers: so that in all these respects they are found to be most necessary.

But their chiefest force and virtue consisteth not herein, so much as in that they are heavenly ceremonies which God hath sanctified and ordained to be administered in His Church; first, as marks whereby to know when God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof; and, secondly, as means conditional, which God requireth in them unto whom He imparteth grace. For since God himself is invisible, and cannot by us be discerned working, therefore when it seemeth good in the eyes of His heavenly wisdom that men for some special intent and purpose should take notice of His glorious presence, He giveth them some plain and sensible token whereby to know what they cannot see. For Moses to see God and live was impossible; yet Moses by fire knew where the glory of God extraordinarily was present.[*] The angel by whom God endued the waters of the pool, called Bethesda, with supernatural virtue to heal, was not seen of any, yet the time of the angel's presence was known by the troubled motions of the waters themselves.[†] The Apostles, by fiery tongues which they saw, were admonished when the Spirit, which they could not behold, was upon them.[‡] In like manner it is with us. Christ and His Holy Spirit, with all their blessed effects, though entering into the soul of man, we are not able to apprehend or to express how, do notwithstanding give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible.

Seeing therefore that grace is a consequent of sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from God himself the Author of sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them, it may be hereby both understood that sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life, because they contain in themselves no vital force or efficacy; they are not physical but moral instruments of salvation; duties of service and worship; which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable. For all receive not the grace of God which receive the sacraments of His grace. Neither is it ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any but by the sacraments; which grace also they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, receive it from Him and not from them. For of sacraments the very same is true which Solomon's wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent, "He that turned towards it was not healed by the thing he saw, but by Thee, O Saviour of all."[§] This is therefore the necessity of sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of His whole Church, by sacraments He severally deriveth into every member thereof.

Sacraments serve as the instruments of God, to that end and purpose; moral instruments, the use whereof is in our own hands, the effect in His; for the use we have His express commandment; for the effect, His conditional promise. So that without our obedience to the one, there is of the other no apparent assurance; as contrariwise, where the signs and sacraments of His grace are not either through contempt unreceived, or received with contempt, we are not to doubt but that they really give what they promise, and are what they signify. For we take not baptism nor the eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify.

There have grown in the doctrine concerning sacraments many difficulties, for want of distinct explication what kind or degree of grace doth belong unto each sacrament. The true immediate cause why baptism and why the supper of our Lord is necessary, few do rightly and distinctly consider. It cannot be denied but sundry the same effects and benefits which grow unto men by the one sacrament may rightly be attributed unto the other. Yet then doth baptism challenge to itself but the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing.

We receive Christ Jesus in baptism once, as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often, as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life. By baptism therefore we receive Christ Jesus, and from Him that saving grace which is proper unto baptism. By the other sacrament we receive Him also, imparting therein Himself and that grace which the Eucharist properly bestoweth. So that each sacrament having both that which is general or common, and that also which is peculiar unto itself, we may hereby gather that the participation of Christ, which properly belongeth to any one sacrament, is not otherwise to be obtained but by the sacrament whereunto it is proper.

The grace which we have by the Holy Eucharist, doth not begin but continue life. No man therefore receiveth this sacrament before baptism, because no dead thing is capable of nourishment. That which groweth must of necessity first live. If our bodies did not daily waste, food to restore them were a thing superfluous. And it may be that the grace of baptism would serve to eternal life, were it not that the state of our spiritual being is daily so much hindered and impaired after baptism. In that life therefore, where neither body nor soul can decay, our souls shall as little require this sacrament, as our bodies corporal nourishment. But as long as the days of our warfare last, during the time that we are both subject to diminution and capable of augmentation in grace, the words of our Lord and Saviour Christ will remain forcible: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you."[‖] Life being therefore proposed unto all men as their end, they who by baptism have laid the foundation and attained the first beginning of a new life, have here their nourishment and food prescribed for continuance of life in them. Such as will live the life of God, must eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man; because this is a part of that diet, which if we want we cannot live. Whereas therefore in our infancy we are incorporated into Christ, and by baptism receive the grace of His Spirit without any sense or feeling of the gift which God bestoweth: in the Eucharist we so receive the gift of God, that we know by grace what the grace is which God giveth us; the degrees of our own increase in holiness and virtue we see and can judge of them; we understand that the strength of our life begun in Christ is Christ, that His flesh is meat, and His blood drink; not by surmised imagination, but truly; even so truly that through faith we perceive in the body and blood sacramentally presented, the very taste of eternal life; the grace of the sacrament is here as the food which we eat and drink.

What these elements are in themselves, [the bread and the wine in the holy Eucharist,] it skilleth not; it is enough, that to me who take them they are the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness whereof sufficeth; His word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God, thou art true; O my soul, thou art happy!

Thus, therefore, we see that howsoever men's opinions do otherwise vary, nevertheless, touching Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, we may with consent of the whole Christian world conclude they are necessary, the one to initiate or begin, the other to consummate or make perfect our life in Christ.—*Hooker.*

---

[*] Exod. iii. 2.

[†] John v. 4.

[‡] Acts ii. 3.

[§] Wisdom xvi. 7.

[‖] John vi. 53.

RESTORATION OF THE MUSIC OF THE CHURCH.

Now that the persevering study of vocal music has become prevalent, and almost general, it were much to be wished that it should be turned to one of its noblest and most edifying uses—the restoration of the music of the Church to a proper state of decorous solemnity and grandeur. It was evidently the intention of the compilers of our liturgy, that music should be largely employed in the public services of the Church of England. Besides the Psalms at morning and evening prayer, the Hymns which follow the first and second lessons are permitted to be sung. The solemn confessions of her faith, the Apostles', Athanasian, and Nicene Creeds, the Church orders to be "sung or said," thus evidently intimating that the preferable mode, wherever practicable, is to *sing* them, allowing us to *say* them when that alternative is necessary. In the most fervent of our supplications, she desires to raise her devotion to the highest point, by the aid of music, commanding her litany to be "sung or said," thus again giving the preference to singing.

One example more: "The order for the burial of the dead." In this last office which the Church performs over the graves of her children, she calls in the aid of music to heighten the effect and deepen the impressions of that solemn occasion; and prescribes that, when practicable, a large proportion of the service shall be *sung*. Thus, theoretically, music forms a most important element in the services of the Church of England. And we verily believe, until this element is practically evolved, that the Church cannot make fair trial of her powers. Will any man of common sense tell us that the droning of a solo clerk, or the screaming of a few discordant trebles, ay, and the bad taste and vulgarity of some of those modern hymns which are so often substituted for the music of the Church, will not go far to neutralize or banish the solemn, and yet elevated, devotion which our liturgy is so calculated to produce? Will any one tell us that such disgusting burlesques suit well the tone and spirit of our noble collects? Will any one maintain that they are really calculated to *raise* our devotional feelings, and elicit emotions meet for those whose feet stand in the house of their God? And, in the name of reason, what else can be the use of Church music? The mere *opus operatum* of mouths being opened and sounds produced, cannot be the thing designed. If music be prescribed as part of the worship of God, what absurdity to substitute for music *exactly* the thing most *exactly* opposite to it, namely, discord, as a fulfilment of this command!

Yes, the music of the Church, even tolerably cultivated, would tell potently upon the religion of our country. How many who now sit listless and uninterested in our country churches, how many who never enter a church, would be attracted by fine music, and learn instructions from those sounds which they first listened to only as a luxury! How many children would call the Sabbath a delight, principally because they were early trained to take their part in the sacred chorus! How many happy associations would bind the heart of each village choir to the church where, with their earliest friends and companions, they have been taught to sing the praises of God with joyful lips! With what interest would each recurring festival be regarded even by imbecile old age, which brought with it the remembrance of the Easter or the Christmas anthem, in which we were wont to join our own with voices long since silent.—*Musical World.*

ABOLITION OF PEWS.

It affords us sincere pleasure to be able to confirm the statement recently made by "The Times," that the puny and paltry fashion of pews "*is now on the point of extermination,*"—"a fashion which boxes up a few in '*respectable*' and '*comfortable*' pews, leaving the unprivileged many to stand and shiver where they can, and, in many cases, to walk away from the church to the gin-shop," (the latter being *always* open for their reception, whilst the former (the house of God and Prayer) is too often virtually closed against them. The majority of our parish churches are in such a state of decay as to excite feelings of the deepest humiliation in every Christian heart and pious mind. They stand silent monuments of our selfishness and irreligion; and if such be, unfortunately, the condition of the *sacred fabrics themselves*—which we unhesitatingly affirm from indisputable authority it is—surely it is not surprising that the same selfishness and irreverence for things holy should, in a still greater degree, be discernible *within* them. Thus whilst we perceive that large pews, with every modern comfort—stoves, carpets, curtains, screens, and, in some memorable cases, even glass windows—have been erected for the *rich*, the *poor* have, in too many instances, been left unprovided with seats of any kind; and where a sense of shame has led to seats being set apart for the poor, they have invariably been placed in such positions that the *aged and infirm* could neither hear nor see, nor could they occupy the seats apportioned to them except at the sacrifice of health to devotion.

When the poor are disregarded, God is sure to be himself dishonored. What can be more melancholy than to behold the present condition of our holy altars and baptismal fonts; the state in which they are now to be found is such as to reflect disgrace upon the Established Church, and all the bishops and archdeacons throughout the kingdom. We should have held it impossible that the holy sacrament of baptism could have been administered in any parish church, except with becoming solemnity. We have, however, recently seen some fonts which decency prevents our attempting to describe. Whilst alluding to the furniture of the church, we will just observe, that *Poor Boxes* seem to be regarded as a very unnecessary appendage to the portals of God's house, at least we may judge so from the numerous instances in which they were not to be found. We entreat the attention of the archdeacons and rural deans to this sad neglect.

We will now, however, enter upon the more pleasing part of our duty, and lay before our readers such information as cannot fail to afford them sincere gratification, by encouraging the hope of better things hereafter. We learn that a very important note has been lately appended to one of the rules of the incorporated society, suggesting a new plan of dividing the seats in churches *where some pews are tolerated*. Formerly the pews were always put towards the eastern end, and the "free seats" of the poor thrust back to the west end, under the gallery, exposed to draughts, and often out of sight and hearing of the altar. It is now recommended to divide the church *longitudinally*; assigning, for instance, the *north* side to the pews, and the whole south to the open seats; so that at least some of the poor may have a chance of approaching the altar, and sharing the privileges generally now reserved for the rich. This is not enough, according to our principles, but at least it is an improvement.

It is satisfactory to be able to state, that much has already been done; but it is still more so, to have it in our power to inform our readers, that a great deal more is under consideration, having for the main object additional accommodation for the poor in the national churches.

In Westminster Abbey the choir is to be altered, the present miserable screen-work is to be removed, and pews abolished.

In the Cathedral at Canterbury, the choir is about to be furnished with new stalls and a throne, and all the pews are to be removed.

The new church in the Broadway, Westminster, has been built without pews.

The new church at Wilton, built at the sole expense of the Hon. Sidney Herbert, has been likewise built without pews.

Bakewell church, Derbyshire, has been rebuilt, and not a single pew retained.

At Stogumber, Somersetshire, all the pews have been ejected.

At St. Nicholas, Hereford, pews are in course of being removed.

At St. Margaret's, Ipswich, pews have been ejected.

At Harwich pews are being taken down.

In Eastwell church, Kent, pews have just been removed.

At Cowfold, Sussex, pews are being taken down.

At St. Nicholas, Shoreham, pews are about to be taken down, and open seats provided. This has been done at the recommendation of the Oxford Architectural Society.

At Tuxford, pews are being removed.

At All Saints', Stamford, pews are being all cleared away, and the beautiful church is about to be restored.

At St. Lawrence, Hawkhurst, pews being removed.

Throughout Suffolk the removal of pews is general.

At St. John's, Deritend, pews have been ejected.

At Stifford, Essex, pews ejected, low open seats substituted.

Charter House chapel, low open seats, pews removed.

Elford, near Lichfield, pews cleared out. (This is the parish church of the talented author of St. Antholin's.)

Pews are about to be removed from the churches of the Holy Trinity, at Hull, and St. Mary's Redcliffe, at Bristol.

The new church at Marchwood has been built without pews, and the new church of St. Peter's, Bishport, (just consecrated by the Bishop of Salisbury,) has no pews, *all the seats being free and unappropriated*. In fine, we understand that without it be provided that *proper* accommodation be set apart for the *poor* in the *new churches*, which we rejoice to see springing up around us, charitable and religious persons *now refuse to subscribe*. This unquestionably is an effectual mode of ensuring attention to the spiritual claims of the humbler classes of the community, who instead of being repelled from their parish church, ought to be encouraged to frequent it.

We cannot conclude these remarks without *again* recommending to the earnest attention of our readers a pamphlet, designated "*A few Remarks on Pews,*" by J. W. Bowden, Esq., just published by Rivingtons. The author shows first, the absurdity and the impropriety of enclosing spaces in the church, which is in theory open to all for particular occupation. Then he considers the system as affecting the relative position and privileges of the rich and poor. The effects produced on both classes are clearly set forth, and contrasted with the certain result of the extinction of the pew system. The most important point, however, is the proof that pews operate most powerfully in "keeping thousands, and tens of thousands, around us in a state of practical heathenism." (P. 23.) The "bargaining and trafficking in holy things" caused by the system is ably exposed. These are the principal points discussed: and they are all strikingly, yet reverentially urged. The writer concludes with recommending the *longitudinal* division of churches, and pressing the importance of some change in the present regulations of the "Church Commissioners," which are formed on the supposition that pews and pew rents are a fundamental condition of a church, *instead of a blighting evil only to be tolerated under extreme cases.* Mr. Bowden's book is sure to do very wide and permanent good. *The Times* is right—*the puny and paltry fashion of pews is now on the point of extermination.*—*British Queen.*

CONSECRATION OF THE CHAPEL OF THE HOLY TRINITY, CROCKERTON, NEAR WARMINSTER.

The hamlet of Crockerton, in the parish of Longbridge Deverill, of which the Rev. and Right Hon. Lord Charles Thynne is the incumbent. By his pious exertions, aided by the liberal, yet private and unostentatious benefactions of many friends, a Chapel of Ease has been built in this manufacturing hamlet for the accommodation of nearly **500** persons, upon the plans and under the superintendence of Thomas H. Wyatt, Esq., the architect of the Salisbury Diocesan Church Building Association, from the funds of which a grant of **£150** has been made towards its erection. The chapel, which stands near to the western edge of the grounds of Longleat, and at about four miles from that noble mansion, was consecrated by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, on Thursday last, the **20th** inst. The building is in its main features Norman, but without such strict adherence to the English models of that style as to exclude a free use of some of its more continental forms. It consists, after the manner of chapels, of a single body. At the northwestern corner is placed the tower, with a dwarf steeple; the windows in the tower being of pierced work, and the columns of the arches carried below the windows of the same depth as above, so as to form inverted arches embracing a cross. At each angle of the tower are the emblems of the Holy Evangelists, looking forth as it were to all parts of the world. In a line with the tower are the porch and vestry, externally appearing as part of the main building, and forming altogether a very well arranged western front, of which the stonework of the windows is more enriched than of those in the other parts of the building. The Apse is intended to be removed and carried further out, so as to form a chancel of considerable depth, which, for the present, the funds will not allow. A Norman cross surmounts the eastern gable. The interior is about **65** feet by **30**, exclusive of the Apse, in which it terminates at the eastern end. Within the Apse, which is paved with encaustic tiles, is the Communion Table, with a credence bracket on the northern side, on which the elements stand previous to the administration of the Communion until the time at which the rubric directs that they shall be placed on the holy table. The windows of the Apse and several others are filled with stained glass, of most appropriate and emblematic designs by Mr. Miller, of Silver-street, Golden Square, London; a rich red cross forming the prominent features of the central one. These and other beautiful portions are the gifts of individuals desiring that the sanctuary of the Most High should not, at least, be less beautiful than the dwellings of men. On either sides of the Altar, and clustering with the windows, are arched niches, containing the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, illuminated. The Pulpit is made of stone in the southeastern angle of the body, and in the opposite angle a double Reading Desk of low open work and massive. At the foot of the Apse or chancel steps is a simple lectern, on which rests the Holy Bible, for the reading of the Lessons. A Gallery at the west end is supported by a screen, so arranged as to form on the southern side a Baptistery with a massive Font, on which are figures of the Holy Apostles. The Roof externally is covered with red tile; internally it consists of chamfered tie-beams, with brackets and pendants, queenposts, collars principals, and partins united by curved ribs, all of which are seen in dark wood; and on the tie-beams, as well as on other parts of the Church, are well selected and beautifully painted passages of Holy Scripture. The seats are all unappropriated, open, and free, as they ought to be in every Christian Church, and the whole is pregnant with devotional feeling, having that tone so well calculated to foster and give satisfaction to reverential and devout minds. The cost was comparatively small. If the outward structure is such, much more was that solemn service calculated to produce the same effect. Our good and reverend bishop entered the church at the head of sixty of his clergy in surplices and hoods, besides others not so habited. He was attended by his chaplains, the canon Hamilton, and the Rev. the Hon. C. Harris, and by the Chancellor of the Diocese, James Hope, Esq. The Rev. the Lord Charles Thynne, assisted by his curate, the Rev. Mr. Wordsworth, performing the ordinary service of the day. The bishop himself preached, from the text, "My house shall be called the house of prayer," showing the character and objects of the sanctuary, in every dispensation, to have been those of worship, instruction being only an incidental, though a valuable accompaniment. He urged forcibly upon both clergy and laity the importance of this truth, and reminded them that the end of all efficient preaching should be, if rightly directed, to produce not a listening, but a praying people. From a forgetfulness of this, came the indevout and indolent and self-indulgent postures, which, contrary to the recorded practice of the Lord and his Apostles, and all humble supplicants mentioned in the word of God, marked so many congregations as hearers, and not as worshippers; and the no less unsuitable and unseemly arrangements which made so many of our churches places of hearing, and not sanctuaries for prayer.

Such wholesome instructions are much needed, and call for gratitude, while they hold out a hope that, as year after year calls for notice of the erection or rebuilding of other churches in this diocese, the arrangements may be equally beautiful and equally suited to their holy purposes.

After the sermon was ended, the offertory was read by the bishop, and a collection of offerings made to the amount of £180, inclusive of the sums offered by the afternoon congregation, composed chiefly of the poor. After this the holy eucharist was administered to all the clergy present, and to about an equal number of the laity. The usual service was solemnized in the afternoon, the Archdeacon Lear preaching a sermon.

Such occasions are bright spots in the midst of a world which brings more or less trial to all, and are eminently calculated at once to spread an increased feeling of sound religion amongst the laity, to stir them up to go and do likewise, to lead the clergy to more unanimous co-operation, to gather the affections of all around the bishops of the Church, and to impress the reality of that, for the sake of which so many daily, and we may trust acceptable sacrifices are made.—*Dorset County Chronicle.*

CHURCHMAN'S BOOKSTORE.

JAMES A. SPARKS,
109 *NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK,*
Has lately Published
THE FOLLOWING MUSICAL WORKS,
Adapted to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and others using Chants:

Gregorian and other Ecclesiastical Chants,

Adapted to the Psalter and Canticles, as they are pointed to be sung in churches. From the 2d London edition. This work contains: 1. The eight Gregorian Tones, with their several endings; 2. A variety of the same tones harmonized for four voices, but so as to preserve unaltered the original melodies; 3. Miscellaneous Chants; 4. The Versicles and Responses, from Tallis's Cathedral Service. To which are added, KYRIE ELEISON, a TRISAGION, never before published, by Edward Hodges, Esq., Mus. Doc., Director of the Music in Trinity Parish; and RESPONSES to the Decalogue.

The Canticles of the Church;

Being portions of the services which may be "*said or sung,*"—pointed and arranged in *bars* corresponding with the music to which they may be sung. The design of this work is to enable the congregation to unite with the Choir in performing this part of the service

Te Deum and Jubilate (in A),

By WM. BOYCE, Mus. Doc. Circ. 1760. With an easy arrangement for the Organ and Piano Forte, by EDWARD HODGES, Mus. Doc., Director of the Music of Trinity Church, New York. This work contains 18 quarto pages, with an engraved title page, suitable in form to bind with other music. Price 75 cents. The attention of the friends of Church Music of the *highest order* is respectfully solicited to this work.

Music of the Church, (with a Supplement,)

A Collection of Psalm, Hymn, and Chant Tunes, adapted to the worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. By the Rev. Dr. Wainwright. 7th edition.

J. A. S. has constantly on sale:

THE CHURCH CHOIR, parts First and Second. By the Rev. Mr. Muenscher. Price $1. The Second Part, consisting of Chants, Anthems, and Sentences—price 62½ cents.

THE CHANTS OF THE CHURCH. By Messrs. Darley & STANDBRIDGE. Price 75 cents.

GEMS OF SACRED MUSIC: consisting of eleven Introductory Sentences, and one Funeral Anthem for four voices; with an accompaniment for the Piano Forte or Organ. Selected from the best composers, and arranged by J. C. B. Standbridge, Organist of Christ Church, Philadelphia.

LOUD'S ORGAN STUDY: A thorough System of Instruction on the Organ. Price $5.

STANDBRIDGE'S PIANO-FORTE INSTRUCTION. Price $3. A liberal discount made to Choirs and wholesale dealers.

AN ESSAY ON THE CULTIVATION OF CHURCH MUSIC. By Edward Hodges, Esq., Mus. Doct., late of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, England. Pp. 24. Price 18 cents.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES, in 3 vols. Price $5. Also, No. 90. Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles. By Members of the University of Oxford. Printed from the second English edition. Price 37½ cents.

PLAIN SERMONS. By Contributors to the Tracts for the Times. 2 vols. Price $1 50. The publisher will venture to say, that no religiously disposed person can attentively read these Sermons without being profited thereby.

The following is from the Bishop of New York:

RECOMMENDATION.

"These volumes of '*Plain Sermons*' appear to me to be admirably adapted to the conveying of religious instruction on the sound principles of the Gospel, and are therefore recommended to the members of my diocese, for private and family reading. I also hereby authorize the public reading of them, together with such others as I may from time to time appoint, by lay-readers within said diocese.

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK,
Bishop of the Diocese of New York
New York, June 14, 1841.

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM,

By the late Rev. Alexander Hay, of Virginia; with letters commendatory from the Rt. Rev. Bishop Chase, and the Rev. Dr. Shelton, and a sketch of the life of the author by the Rev. C. Dresser.

As an unanswerable treatise in favor of Infant Baptism, this work cannot fail to be read with profit by Presbyterians and Methodists as well as Churchmen. It is clear, concise, and convincing, and treats the subject in a kind and Christian spirit. It contains 131 pages; and in order to give it a general circulation, will be sold as low as possible. A part of the edition will be bound in paper cover so as to be sent by mail to any part of the country.

J. A. S. has constantly on sale, PRAYER BOOKS of every description and style of binding, at prices varying from 25 cents upward; together with all the Standard Works of the Church. Clergymen can be supplied at reduced prices.

J. A. S. begs leave to offer his services to Clergymen and others at a distance from the New York Book Market, to purchase Books for them on the most reasonable terms, and to forward them, as may be directed, to any part of the United States, or Canada.

Orders enclosing Cash for any book in this market, or for Sunday School Libraries, will be promptly attended to.

He begs leave to refer on this subject to the Right Rev. the Bishop of New York, the Right Rev. Bishop Chase of Illinois; the Rev. Messrs. D. S. Lewis, St. Francisville, La.; W. D. Cairns, Columbus, Ga.; J. A. M'Kenney, Cambridge, Md.; Rev. Dr. Seabury, New York; C. N. S. Rowland, and Cornelius Oakley, Esqs., New York; Rev. W. F. Walker, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.; and Rev. Dr. Chase, of Bellows' Falls, Vt.

BISHOP HOPKINS' Second Letter to Bishop Kenrick.
Bishop Hopkins' First Letter to same—a few copies.
Bishop Hopkins on the Prediction of the Second Advent in 1843.
For sale at the Church Depository,
April 15. No. 20 John street.

MISS SAGAR AND MISS BALLOW'S
BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,
No. 10 Albion Place, (Fourth Street.)
NEW YORK.

The Summer Quarter will commence on the 9th of May; but Pupils are received at any period, the proportion only of the quarter being charged.

Particular attention is paid to the French language, which is made, as far as possible, the medium of conversation. Young ladies who do not wish to pursue a full course of study, may join the classes attending to this language, or to any other particular branch.

Great care is also bestowed upon the instruction of younger scholars, and a reasonable deduction is made in the charge for Boarders in the Junior Department.

April 1.—tf.

WORKS ON EPISCOPACY.
BOWDEN AND COOK. Also, Dr. Cook's Answer to the Princeton Review. For sale at this office. May 6.

CHURCH MUSIC.
A NEW GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.
JUST PUBLISHED,
BY J. A. SPARKS, 109 Nassau street, a *Gloria in Excelsis*, with an easy arrangement for the Organ and Piano Forte, by "A Contributor to Church Music."

This contribution to Church Music has been performed in a neighboring city for some time, and pronounced by competent judges equal, if not superior, to any now in use. It is engraved, and printed on fine music paper, and suitable in size to bind with other music. Dec. 31.

CHURCH AND PARLOR ORGANS.—GEO. JARDINE, *Organ Builder*, Anthony-st., next door to Broadway, New York, manufactures in the most superior manner, and at reasonable prices, all kinds of Organs, from the largest size to the smallest. Also Church Organs with barrel movements in addition to the finger-keys, by which psalmody is performed in the first style of execution and by the simplest mechanical means. This class of Organs is particularly useful in country churches, where organists cannot be procured, and has long been in general use in country churches throughout England.

For Sale,

Several Parlor Organs, in rich mahogany cases, at low prices.

Also, Church Organs of great volume and sweetness of tone, in elegant Gothic cases, 5 feet wide, 8½ feet high, built expressly for country churches—price $300.

Also, a large Church Organ, with two sets of keys, 12 stops—pedals, swell, &c., in elegant case, painted mahogany color—10 feet wide, 15 feet high—price $1500. July 16—y1v

LOUD'S ORGAN STUDY.
A SUPPLY of the above valuable work just received and for sale at this office.
April 2.

☞ JOHN MORISON, Sexton in the Parish of Trinity Church, and Undertaker, having been appointed by the Corporation of Trinity Church, Superintendent of Funerals and Interments in the ground belonging to them, all applications for interments in their ground must be made to him from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. at the Trinity Church Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church sts, and at other hours at his house, No. 17 Clarkson st, near Hudson st. He will find all articles requisite for funerals on reasonable terms, and give punctual attendance Dec 11—y1y

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE
GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
DEPOSITORY, No. 20 JOHN STREET, NEW YORK.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer, perhundred,		$3 00
Prot Epis S S Book, No. 1, per hundred,		1 38
" " " 2,	"	1 75
" " " 3,	"	2 00
" " " 4,	"	5 00
Questions on the S S Books,	"	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,) per hun.		1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,)	"	5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	3 00
Church Catechism,	"	1 25
First Truths,	"	2 50
Duty to God,	"	0 50
Church Primer,	"	1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 75
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	20 00
" " Vol. 2, New do	"	22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"	2 50

A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LIBRARY, 76 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.

THE SAME, bound in 139 volumes of various prices.—Total, $18 90 nett.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 28 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $5 80 nett.

The JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to
DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John st.
New York, March 18, 1843.

THE CHURCHMAN,
EDITED BY
THE REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,
And under the General Direction and Supervision of
THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
of whom it is the Official Organ of Communication with his Diocese.

It is published every Saturday for the proprietors, by
JAMES A. SPARKS,
109 Nassau-street, New York, *up stairs.*

Its object is to disseminate religious intelligence, elucidate Christian doctrine, and explain and enforce the principles and precepts of evangelical piety.

For the proper and more effectual accomplishment of these objects, it is, as it ever has been, since its establishment in 1831, devoted to the interests, in every department, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to this end sets forth, elucidates, and when necessary defends, those principles and that policy, which have ever characterized the Diocese of New York, and by the divine blessing on which that Diocese has been enabled to maintain so much efficiency in promoting

"THE UNITED INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH."

Communications intended for insertion should be addressed to the *Editor*, and letters on business to the *Publisher*.

TERMS. *Three dollars* per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for less than six months; and none discontinued until arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietor.

AGENTS.

Rev. Charles Burroughs, D. D.	Portsmouth, N. H.
George M. Marsh,	
Charles Stimpson, jun.	Boston, Mass
Samuel R. Slack,	East Cambridge, "
Charles Burnett, jr.	Providence, R. I.
David Le Favour,	Pawtucket, "
G. G. Smith,	St. Albans, Vt.
Rev. Josiah Perry,	Brandon, "
Frederick Sill,	Middletown, "
Sidney Babcock,	New Haven, Con
Henry S. Parsons,	Hartford, "
W. C. Little, Esq.	Albany, N. Y.
Charles B. Pinckney,	Catskill, "
Stephen P. Nash, Esq.	Saratoga Springs, "
A. A. Van Voorst,	Schenectady, "
Young & Hart,	Troy, "
Alexander Walsh, Esq (gratis)	Lansingburgh, "
Ebenezer C. Arnold,	Poughkeepsie, "
William Purdy,	Newburgh, "
Thomas C. Miller,	Auburn, "
Dr. A. F. Dodge,	Geneva, "
Isaiah Tiffany,	Utica, "
J. F. Hutchinson, Esq. P. M.	Watertown, "
A. B. Watson,	Unadilla, "
Henry Adriance,	Oswego, "
H. N. Walker,	Buffalo, "
D. L. Farnam, Esq	Fayetteville, "
R. S. H. George, Bookseller, 26 South Fifth street,	Philadelphia
H. J. Terry, Esq.,	Newcastle, Del.
Knight & Colburn,	Baltimore, Md
J. Biscoe, Post Office,	Chaptico, "
Wm. W. Johnston, Esq., P. M.	Princess Ann, "
Bell & Entwistle,	Alexandria, D. C.
George Rowland, Esq.,	Norfolk, Va.
Joseph Gill,	Richmond, "
A. A. Brown, Esq	Wilmingon, N. C.
A. E. Miller,	Charleston, S. C.
G. McLaughlin,	Augusta, Ga.
Solomon K. Grant,	Louisville, Ky.
William Iucho,	Lexington, "
Arius Nye,	Marietta, Ohio
Lewis Handerson,	Cleveland, "
Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office,	Quincy, Ill.
P. E. Demill, Esq.	Jackson, Michigan.
Rev. E. O. Hodgkin,	Homer, "
David H. Armstrong,	St. Louis, Mo.
Brevoort Butler,	Natchez, Miss.